

The Lord's Supper not a SACRIFICE:

O R,

*The DOCTRINE of a Material Sacrifice in the
Lord's Supper not founded on Scripture.*

701. d. 14
11

BEING A
D E F E N C E

OF THE
Plain Account, &c.

OF THE
L O R D's S U P P E R,

So far as relates to this POINT.

In ANSWER to some late Writers.

By *T H O M A S W I N G F I E L D*, M. A.

Vicar of *Yalmeton*, with the Chapel of *Revelstock*
annex'd, in the County of *DEVON*: And late
Fellow of *St. John's College* in *OXFORD*.

The SECOND EDITION, with a *Preface*.

*'So long as the Law did reign, God suffered dumb Beasts to be offered
'unto him, but now that we be Spiritual, we must offer Spiritual
'Oblations; in the Place of Calves, Sheep, Goats and Doves,
'we must kill devilish Pride, furious Anger, insatiable Cove-
'tousness, filthy Lucre, stinking Lechery, deadly Hatred and Ma-
'lice, Foxy Wiliness, Wolfish Ravening and Devouring, and all
'other unreasonable Lusts and Desires of the Flesh.— These be
'the Sacrifices of Christian Men, these Holts and Oblations
'be acceptable to Christ.'* Archbishop *Cranmer's Treatise on
the Lord's Supper*, Fol. 100. Edit. 1550.

L O N D O N:

Printed for *E. COMINS*, at the South Entrance of the Royal
Exchange; and Sold by *T. COOPER*. M.DCC.XXXIX.

1

1



T
ve
ha
th
an
is
th
th
ely
co
Sa
ye
th



P R E F A C E

TO THE

R E A D E R.

TH E following TREATISE was first published some Time before the learned Dr. WATERLAND'S Review appear'd. Had that elaborate Performance been made public before this Tract was printed, this very probably had never seen the Light ; but, like its Author, would have remained unknown, and unheard of. For that learned Gentleman declares himself so fully, and expressly against the material Hypothesis, and is so very well qualified to answer every Cavil, that shall be raised in any Shape, to support it, that it must have been wholly needless for any one else to have appeared in that Controversy.

But when several Books were wrote [and recommended by others] in Defence of a material Sacrifice in the LORD'S SUPPER, and no one, as yet, had appear'd against them ; lest they should think themselves unanswerable, I thought it my

Duty to appear against them (small as I am!) my self, being convinced in my own Mind, that their Hypothesis was wrong, because founded (as I apprehend) on mistaken Interpretations of Scripture.

And, I humbly conceive, that it is no Mark of Vanity, or Self-sufficiency in any Man to think, that those Arguments which have convinced him of any particular Point in Debate, would have the same Effect upon others. It is indeed no more than what every Man must think, who publishes his Thoughts upon any Topic whatever.

Neither can I apprehend it is any Argument of a Man's entertaining an Opinion of his own Sufficiency, when he declares the Scriptures to be his only authoritative Guide in Matters of Religion; nor is he presently to be censur'd, as one that despises the Fathers, and all that have wrote before him; because he refuses to submit to those particular Opinions of theirs, in which, he apprehends, there is a Contrariety to Scripture Truth.

For though we may safely follow the Fathers in some Things, this is no Argument that we should submit to them in all: Nor because they have excellently well interpreted some Passages of Scripture, are they therefore to be deemed INFALLIBLE in all: We thankfully receive any Helps (let them come from what Quarter they will) for the better Understanding of the Holy Scriptures: But surely! this is no Reason why we should blindly and implicitly give into any Interpretations, though they come from the Venerable and Pious: But let them be fairly try'd by the com-

Preface to the Reader.

v

mon Rules used in such Cases, and if they appear to convey the true Meaning of Scripture, we shall most willingly embrace and receive them; but we can never submit to them at any Time, how powerfully soever they may be recommended, or even thunder'd into our Ears, when there is either a plain Reason, or a plain Text against them.

To do otherwise, would be making the Fathers infallible in the most absolute Sense: It would be placing them in a Rank superior to the Apostles, and even to our LORD himself; for what would it avail our having the Sermons and Discourses of our LORD, and the Epistles of his Apostles, in Writing, before our Eyes, if we must blindly submit to what others shall be pleased to say is the true Meaning of them? To what End was the Scripture given, but to be the Standard of our Faith; and the Rule whereby to try all Opinions and Decrees whatever in Matters of Religion? And whatever round-about Ways Men may take to find out the Truth, this is its only Criterion at last.

But---- Does it not argue great Conceitedness, and Self-sufficiency to expect to be heard against the united Voice of so many Centuries? And shall a private Person set himself up in Opposition to Fathers, and the Decrees of Councils?---- This, I must own, is plausible, and Men may harangue for a long while together, with a good deal of popular Eloquence upon this Topic: For the Modest and Diffident should be encouraged, and the Forward, with the Overbearing, should be checked and awed.

But,

But, with all Submission, let me also put a Question. Will our Adversaries themselves be content to submit to every Point without Exception, which can be proved to be the Doctrine of the Church in the Ages next after the Apostles? I believe I may venture to answer for them, that they should be cautious of subscribing to so general a Declaration without some qualifying Clause; which qualifying Clause, how softly soever expressed, would be the Means of expunging several Articles, that were most firmly embraced, and perhaps universally received in those Ages. I need mention only one Instance for all, and that is, the Doctrine of Christ's temporal Reign upon Earth a thousand Years, when the Elect being gather'd together in the City of Jerusalem, should there enjoy for that Space of Time, all the Delights imaginable, &c. yet this Doctrine prevailed a long Time under the Character of an apostolical Tradition.

And might it not have been said to the Man, who had the Courage first to dispute this Doctrine (with the same Justice as it may be said now to those who dare dissent from any Thing, the Fathers have deliver'd as apostolical Doctrine) will you be so arrogant as to think you understand the Scriptures better than these great Luminaries of the Church? And must not those, who lived so near the Fountain-head, and conversed, some of them, with the Apostles, and more with apostolical Men, have had better Opportunities of knowing the Truth than you, who live so many Years after? Or, Do you think it possible, that those primitive Saints and Martyrs should

agree

ag
bo
all
Ad
fer
fene
Do
the
in n
fion
mar
view
give
take
WA
wha
than
since
hope
Par

a B
jam C
ferre,
time c
doctrin
fenseru
ratione
The
Opinio
tings,
sons;
as they
they on
ing fro
erred.
p. 162

agree to alter the apostolical Doctrine?---- And how should a Man have defended himself against all these pressing Questions? that I leave our Adversaries to answer. Only I beg Leave to observe, That the same Argument, which may defend St. CYPRIAN for rejecting the millenary Doctrine, will equally serve for our Vindication, who reject the material Sacrifice.

This is what I thought necessary just to hint in my own Justification against that rude Aspersi-
on of Dr. Brett, in the Beginning of his Remarks on the learned Dr. WATERLAND's Review: And lest what hath been now said should give him fresh Occasion to abuse me, when he takes it into his Head to write against Dr. WATERLAND again, I beg leave to observe, that what I have here said, is no more, and no other than what St. AUSTIN^a himself hath said: And since he is so great an Admirer of the Fathers, I hope I may therefore escape his Censure as to this Particular.

^a Ego fateor charitati tuæ, solis eis Scripturarum libris, qui jam Canonici appellantur, didici hunc timorem, honoremque deferre, ut nullum eorum Auctorem scribendo aliquid errasse firmiter credam. — Alios autem ita lego, ut quantâ libet sanctitate, doctrinâque præpoleant, non ideo verum, putem, quia ipsi ita senserunt; sed quia mihi per illos auctores Canonicos, vel probabili ratione, quod a vero non abhorreat, persuadere potuerunt.

The same Thing is expressed by a modern Author thus: — Those Opinions, which we find deliver'd by the Fathers in their Writings, are grounded not upon their bare Authority, but their Reasons; and they bind not our Belief otherwise than, so far forth, as they are consonant either to the Scripture, or to Reason; and they ought to be examined both by one and the other, as proceeding from Persons that are not infallible, but possibly may have erred. — Compare Bishop Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium*, lib. i. p. 162. lib. ii. p. 497. lib. iii. p. 355. Edit. 1660.

But

But why should I give my self any Concern about what such an unruly Writer says, who runs Riot against all the Laws of Decency and good Manners, and throws about his Dirt upon every one, without Exception, who differs from him. For he has behaved with the same Courtliness of Address toward Dr. WATERLAND as my self; and has put me in such very good Company by this his rude Treatment, that I know not whether I ought not to return him my Thanks for it.--- But, indeed, I should not have taken any the least Notice of him, or his unjust Censure, but passed it by as a mere Brutum fulmen, had I not found it necessary upon other Accounts to publish a second Edition of the following Treatise, which I herewith present to the Reader.

I have already observed, that the learned Dr. WATERLAND declares himself in his Review very fully and expressly against the material Hypothesis: This gave such a Wound to the Cause, that a late Writer endeavour'd to patch it up after his Manner, by asserting that the Difference between Dr. WATERLAND, and the maintainers of that Hypothesis, was rather verbal than real: But that learned Gentleman hath since explain'd himself in so ample a Manner, as to shew he is no Friend to the material Scheme. The Consequence of which has been to draw on him all the usual Reproaches (which are a Sort of Cant Phrase, with the Materialists, and) which they bestow, in a plentiful Manner, upon all those who dare to oppose their extravagant Notions. Socinian, Deist, and such like, are what every good Man must expect to hear from them,

them, whenever he ventures to appear against these matchless Writers.

Yet there is one Point the Doctor insists upon, which may seem to give some Countenance to their Scheme, it being (as it were) a Part of their Foundation, viz. that the *Ἀνάμνησις*, or Memorial of our Lord's Death, celebrated in his Supper, refers to God as well as to us. The Arguments in Defence of this Notion, which had been produced by the Materialists, are fully consider'd and answer'd in the following Tract. And the learned Doctor intimates^b, That those Arguments are not Conclusive, and that therefore he does not build this Interpretation of the Word *ἀνάμνησις*, upon them. And when he comes to explain more largely what he means by this Service being to be performed as a Memorial before God, it plainly appears, that his Notion of it is far from being the same, as that of the Materialists.----- And in that large Sense of the Word [as including only the Idea of Acceptable, and Well-pleasing to Almighty God, without any Relation to SACRIFICE] every good Work, every Instance of Obedience to the Commands of God, every Prayer, or religious Service, has an equal Claim to this Name of Memorial before God, with the Lord's Supper it self. But the Question is, Whether our Lord did design this holy Supper should be celebrated as a Memorial to and before God, in a sacrificial View. This the learned Doctor saith cannot certainly be determined from the Words of Institution; the Name

^b Review, p. 90.

[ἀναμνησις] might carry in it such an Allusion, or might be without it.---- A Reason why it should be supposed to be without it the Reader will find in the following Tract. That Argument likewise, which the Doctor makes Use of, p. 106. of the Review drawn from 1 Cor. xi. 26. the Reader will find an Answer to in the following Tract.

The learned Doctor will, I hope, excuse my Freedom in this Particular; but as I know they insist upon this Point, as a fundamental Article in their Scheme, they will be still claiming him as on their Side of the Question, notwithstanding the Doctor's declaring so absolutely against them. And therefore it were to be wished, that when this learned Gentleman comes to reconsider this Point, he would not think it amiss to make some Alterations in his Manner of Expression at least. For though we own it, though we contend for its being an acceptable Service, well-pleasing to Almighty God, when performed worthily; yet we cannot think it therefore ought to be called a Memorial before God, because this Expression is apt to convey with it an Idea, by no Means comports with this holy Rite,





THE
LORD'S SUPPER
NOT A
SACRIFICE, &c.



HERE is a Set of Men in the World, who are an *amphibious* Kind of Animals in Religion; their Principles being of a *motley* Mixture, partly *Romish*, partly *Evangelical*. They declare themselves indeed to be not Members of the Church of *Rome*, but, in their Principles and Practice, chuse to approach as near to her as possible. These are *they*, who assert the Lord's Supper is a *Sacrifice*, 'a *material* Sacrifice, to be offered up to Almighty God, in order to remind him of the Grand Personal Sacrifice of Christ:--- That the End of our Saviour's instituting this holy Ordinance was, not so much to perpetuate his Memory among his Disciples, as to represent, and inculcate his blessed Passion to

‘ the Father ; putting God in mind thereof, by
 ‘ setting the Monuments thereof before him.’
 This Doctrine has lately been maintained with
 no little Confidence, and some Shew of Learning.
 The Author of a Tract called, *The Sacrament of the Altar*, led the Way, who was
 soon followed by Dr. Brett and Mr. Bowyer.
 And we have been lately told, That these *sac-*
crificing Priests^a, ‘ have more to say for them-
 ‘ selves, in Justification of their Notions, than
 ‘ the Author of *The Plain Account*, or any one
 ‘ else will ever be able to answer, upon his
 ‘ Principles.’---- What this Author distinctly
 means by *his Principles*, I am not altogether
 certain that I understand : But if I apprehend
 the Case aright ; there is no other Way, I judge,
 of returning a *clear* and *solid* Answer to what
 these Sacrificers have to say for themselves,
 than by adhering to that fundamental Principle
 of *Protestantism*, and of *The Plain Account* ;
 and which is expressed by the *great* and *good*
 Archbishop CRANMER thus : ‘ The most sure
 ‘ and plain Way is to *cleave* unto *holy Scrip-*
 ‘ *ture.*’ And in another Place thus : ‘ In such
 ‘ wise, Credit is to be given to *God’s Word only*,
 ‘ and not to the Word of *any Man.*’---- But of
 this more hereafter.---- At present let it suf-
 fice just to have touched upon it ; and to ac-
 quaint the Reader, that proceeding upon this
 Principle, I have designedly omitted taking any
 the least Notice, of all that Heap of Quo-
 tations, poured in upon us from Fathers, Coun-

^a Warren’s Answer to *The Plain Account*, Part II. p. 3.

cils, and *Pseudo-primitive Liturgies*, as quite foreign, and impertinent to the Point in hand. All the Arguments, or even *seeming* Arguments, that are brought from *Scripture*, by these Authors to prove their Hypothesis, of the Lord's Supper being a *true* and *proper* Sacrifice, shall be examined in Order : And by these alone let the Merits of the Cause be tryed.

Now ^b the first Text alleged by these Men in Proof of their Hypothesis is, *Malachi* i. 11. *In every Place Incense shall be offered to my Name, and a pure Offering.* The Original *Hebrew* Word מִנְחָה *Mincha*, which is here translated *Offering*, is the same Word which is used in the *Levitical* Law for that Cake, made of Flower and Oil mingled together, which was constantly to be offered or burnt upon the Altar, with all their Burnt-offerings, and Sacrifices : It is called in our *English Translation*, a *Meat-offering*, but might they observe ^c more properly be rendered a *Bread-offering* ; and it was always accompanied with a *Drink-offering*, which was a certain Quantity of Wine offered likewise to Almighty God, by being poured upon the *Altar*. And the Meaning of these Words of the Prophet *Malachi*, according to the Opinion of these Men, is this : ‘ In every
‘ Place Prayer shall be made to me the true
‘ God ; and an *Oblation* offered of *Bread* and
‘ *Wine*. For *Incense*, say they, denotes the *ra-*
‘ *tional* Part of our *Christian* Sacrifice, and *Min-*

^b *Bowyer's Answer to The Plain Account*, p. 35.

^c *Vid. Mr. Mede's Works*, p. 385.

'*cha*, the *material* Part thereof, which is, ob-
'*latio farrea*, a Present of Bread and Wine.'----
In answer to which I observe, that,

1. §. It is no unusual Thing with the Pro-
phets, when they speak of the *Gentiles* coming
into the Church to express their serving the true
God, by such Acts of Devotion as were most in
Use in their own Time; and therefore could be
best understood by those to whom they directed
their Discourses: Such were offering Incense
and Sacrifices, and keeping the solemn Feasts
at *Jerusalem*, to which the *Gentiles*, from all
Parts, should resort, as several Prophecies *meto-*
nymically express their Conversion. Thus, *v. gr.*
it is declared, *Zeck. xiv. 16.* That *all Nations*
shall go up from Year to Year (to *Jerusalem*) *to*
worship the King, the Lord of Hosts, and to keep
the Feast of Tabernacles. Thus again, *Isaiah*
xiv. 21. it is declared in the same Manner,
(because dedicating Free-Will-Offerings, and
making Vows to God, was a considerable Part
of religious Worship among the *Jews*) that the
Gentiles shall do Sacrifice, and Oblation, yea,
they shall vow a Vow unto the Lord, and shall
perform it^d.

Many more Passages of the like Nature
might be produced to confirm this Observation;
but to avoid being tiresome, I omit them: And
the Use I would make of this Observation is
this, *viz.* that these Words of the Prophet
Malachi are not to be understood *literally*.

^d Compare *Isaiah* xviii. 7. lxvi. 23. *Micah* iv. 13. with
the learned Mr. Lowth's Notes.

For we may as well conclude from the Verse cited from *Zechariah*, that it is the Duty of *Christians* now, as it was of the *Jews* formerly, to travel every Year to *Jerusalem* to keep the Feast of *Tabernacles*, because it is declared by the Prophet, that all Nations should do so; as to conclude from the Words in *Malachi*, that we are to offer up a *Mincha* (*i. e.* an Oblation of Bread and Wine) to Almighty God, because it is declared, by this Prophet, that a *Mincha* should be offered up in every Place. The true Meaning of both Passages is, in plain Words, no more than this, *viz.* That all Nations should, equally with the *Jews*, become Worshippers of the true God, Creator of Heaven and Earth.

The same Observation will lead us to the true Sense of those Words of our Saviour, *Matt. v. 23, 24.* *If thou bring thy Gift to the Altar, and there rememberest that thy Brother hath ought against thee: Leave there thy Gift before the Altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy Brother, and then come and offer thy Gift.* (Which^e, we are told, is an Evangelical Constitution, implying that there is a *real ALTAR* in the *Christian Church*, and consequently a *true and proper Sacrifice*.) For let us consider who it was our Saviour addressed himself to in these Words; to the whole Multitude of his Disciples, who were *Jews*. If therefore he would speak so as to be understood by them, he must make Use of those Phrases and Expres-

^e *Bouvyer*, p. 43. and *Brett's Answer to The Plain Account*, p. 77.
sions,

sions, which were in Use among the *Jews*. And the learned Dr. CLARKE has (I think) given the *true* and the *full* Meaning of this Text, in his excellent Paraphrase of the Gospels, in these Words. 'If, when you are about
' to *pay any Act of religious Worship to God*,
' you remember that there is any Offence or
' Difference between you and another :----- Go
' immediately and be reconciled to your Ad-
' versary, and then come and *worship God*.'

That this Precept of our Saviour is Evangelical, is readily allowed^f. It is an Exemplification how far we are to out-strip the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* in our Obedience to the sixth Commandment. That our Saviour would annex no new *Rite* to the legal Sacrifices which he was so soon after to abolish by the Sacrifice of himself upon the Cross, is readily allow'd likewise.----- (However, the judicious Reader will be pleased to observe, that the subject Matter of this Precept is not of a *ritual*, but a *moral* Nature.) But that therefore our Saviour intimated there should be a *real* Altar, and a *true* and *proper* Sacrifice in the *Christian* Church, is absolutely denied, and that for the Reason given above, *viz.* That if our Saviour would speak so as to be understood by *Jews*, he must make Use of those *Terms* and *Phrases* which were in Use among the *Jews*. And *offering Gifts*, or Sacrifices, being a synonymous Term among them, for *worshipping God*; (nay, I know not but it was

^f See Mr. Mede's Works, p. 390. Bowyer, p. 44. and Brett. p. 78.

the most proper Term they had to express the Worship of God by;) he was obliged to make Use of it, in order to be understood by his Hearers; and no other Consequence can fairly be drawn from it.

Our Saviour saith, in another Place *, *When ye STAND praying, forgive if ye have ought against any; that your Father also, which is in Heaven may forgive you your Trespases.* Now would any one argue from hence, that because this is an *Evangelical* Precept, therefore our Saviour intimated, we should *stand* always when we pray, and not *kneel*? Yet this may as fairly be deduced from this Passage of *St. Mark*, as that there is a real *Altar* in the Christian Church, from the other in *St. Matthew*; i. e. in plain *English*, neither of them can.---- But to return to the Prophet *Malachi*.

2. §. It is allowed in the Argument of Mr. *Mede*, cited above, and so it is allowed by all who follow him in *his* Interpretation of that Text, that the Word *Incense* is used in a *figurative* Sense; and that it signifies not *material* Incense, but *the Prayers of the Saints*. It follows therefore, by all the Rules of Interpretation, that the other Word, *Mincha*, is to be interpreted in the same *figurative* Manner ^b. To affirm the contrary, is to affirm, that the same Manner of Expression, in one short Sentence, is to be understood *figuratively*, merely to avoid Absurdities; and in another Part of it must be understood *literally*, notwithstanding

* Mark xi. 25.

^b See *The Plain Account*, p. 17.

the greatest Heap of the same Absurdities.---- The Truth is ; these *figurative* Expressions are not only very common in the Writings of the Prophets, describing the future State of the Christian Church (as I have already observed) but likewise were the most apt and significant, they could then make Use of, to convey to the Minds of their Hearers those Truths that were couched under them : And that they *cannot* possibly, consistent with Reason and Truth, and therefore that they *ought not* to be understood *literally*, will evidently appear to any one who will but attend to the Manner of Expression, and the true Meaning of *Zeck. xiv. 16.*---- But if this will not suffice, let me observe in the next Place, that

3. §. Psalm xl. 6, 7, 8. we read ; *Sacrifice and Offering thou didst not desire*---- *Burnt-offering and Sin-offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo I come, &c.* which the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* tells us, is an Express Abolition of all these Kinds of Sacrifices. Now what is here translated *Offering* in the original *Hebrew*, is *Mincha* ; for thus it stands, *וְבָרַח וּמִנְחָה לֹא חָפְצָה* Sacrifice and *Mincha* thou didst not desire. Here therefore we have the *Authority* of one *inspired* Writer interpreting another, to prove that the *Mincha*, as well as the several other Sorts of Sacrifice, is now wholly taken away. To which we may add the Prophet *Daniel*, who foretelling the exact Time of the Messiah's Appearance in the World, and of his being cut off, informs us likewise, *Chap. ix. 27.* that *He* [the Messiah]

הַחַה] יִשְׁבִּיתוּבָהּ וּמִנְחָה shall cause the Sacrifice and MINCHA to cease. From whence I conclude, that this Text in *Malachi*, does not refer to the Lord's Supper, as being a prophetic Description thereof.

But we may be told, perhaps, that this Text was understood by the *primitive* Fathers, to relate to the Lord's Supperⁱ: That though it be now in a Manner silenced and forgotten, yet it was once, and that in the oldest Times of the Church, a Text of eminent Note, and familiarly known to every Christian; being alledg'd by their Pastors and Teachers, as an express and undoubted Prophecy of the *Christian Sacrifice*, or solemn Worship in the *Eucharist*.

In answer to which let me ask; Who is soonest to be believ'd and follow'd in this Case? an *inspir'd* Apostle and Prophet, or an *uninspir'd* Father of the Church, who, *perhaps*, was hardly born before all the Apostles were dead? For though *Justin Martyr* might understand the Text in this Sense, *i. e.* to be a prophetic Description of a *Sacrifice* in the Lord's Supper: Yet certainly his Authority can be of no Weight with any one, when laid in the Balance against that of *St. Paul*, or the Prophet *Daniel*. Nor ought the Authority of any Father of the Church, supposing him to have liv'd ever so soon after, or even in the Apostles Days, be of any Weight with us, when there is a plain, palpable Reason to the contrary.

ⁱ See Mr. Mede's Works, p. 355.

Having thus pav'd the Way by these few Observations, let us proceed, in the next Place, to examine the Words of Institution, and see what can be learn'd from thence concerning the true Nature of this holy Institution. But before I enter upon this, I cannot but take Notice of a Passage in the Preface of *The Sacrament of the Altar*; wherein we are told, That the Lord's Supper is ^k a *Sacrifice PROPITIATORY*. This, I conceive, is directly contradictory to this Text, *Heb. x. 26. If we sin wilfully after that we have receiv'd the Knowledge of the Truth, there remaineth no more Sacrifice for Sins.* (Neither Representative nor Real.) For if the Bread and Wine are *really* and *truly* offered up to Almighty God in the Lord's Supper, as a *Sacrifice* representative of the personal Sacrifice of Christ, and thereby become *Propitiatory*; it is a *Sacrifice for Sins*: But this the Apostle assures us there is not. *Ergo.*----

If to this it should be objected, That when the Apostle says, *If we sin wilfully,--- There remaineth no more Sacrifice for Sins*: This implies that *there does remain*, or there is a *Sacrifice for Sins*, if we do not sin wilfully, *i. e.* Apostatize. I answer, True, there is a Sacrifice for Sins, or a Sacrifice whereby we obtain Remission of our Sins, provided we do not sin wilfully, *i. e.* apostatize: But then this is the Sacrifice that was offer'd up by our Saviour himself, *upon the Altar of the Cross*, seventeen hun-

^k This same Author saith likewise, p. 56. That the Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist is a *Sin-offering*, a propitiatory Oblation.

dred Years ago ; not any Sacrifice which is now offer'd up by any Priest upon Earth, whatever. My Argument is this.--- In this Text it is more than implied, That there is but *one Sacrifice for Sins* ; which Sacrifice is that of Christ himself upon the *Altar* of the *Cross* ; therefore the Lord's Supper is not a Sacrifice for Sins, it being only a Remembrance of *that* Sacrifice, and as distinct from it, as the *Remembrance* of any Thing is from the Thing remember'd.--- But to the Point in hand.---

We have been told, That the Design of the holy *Eucharist*, as instituted by our Saviour, is to put God in mind of our Saviour's Death and Passion ; to represent to *him* the Death and Passion of his dear Son, by presenting to him the appointed Memorials thereof¹. And that this appears, whether we consider the Words of Institution, the Reason and Nature of the Thing it self, the Practice of Antiquity, or that of our own Church in particular.

What the Practice of Antiquity was, it is of small Importance to know : For if the Doctrine of a Representative *Sacrifice* in the *Lord's Supper* could be fully prov'd from the Words of Institution, and from the Reason and Nature of the Thing it self ; it ought to be received and embraced, though all the *Fathers* should unanimously declare against it. On the other hand, if the Words of Institution, and the Reason and Nature of the Thing it self do prove the contrary, it ought never to be receiv'd and em-

¹ Sacrament of the Altar, p. 11.

braced,

braced, though *all* the *Fathers* jointly conspire to attest it.

And in this I have the Suffrage of the *Church of England*. For in her Book of Homilies, she tells us^m, That the Reason why the School-mens Works are fill'd with so much Vanity, is because they sought not the Will of God in his holy Word, but *the Trade of Custom, the Path of the Fathers, the Practice of the Church*. And though, *perhaps*, there may be some Passages pick'd out which seem to speak otherwise; yet that she does not lay any *great* Stress upon the Practice of Antiquity, is evident from hence; in that, in her own Practice, she hath deviated from it.---- It was the Practice of Antiquity to mix *Water* with the Wine in the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, as being essentially necessary to the due Performance thereof; our Church, on the contrary, hath order'd Wine only to be made Use of.---- It was the Practice of Antiquity to receive it (upon *Sundays* always) *standing*; our Church hath order'd it to be receiv'd *kneeling*. It was the Practice of Antiquity to *reserve* some Part of the *consecrated* Elements, and carry them about to the Houses of the Sick, from the Church; our Church has condemn'd this Practice as contrary to the Word of God.---- It was the Practice of Antiquity to give it to *Children*; our Church gives it to none but *adult* Persons.---- So that, I think, I may safely join with the Author of *The Plain Account*, when he saith, 'It is of

^m Third Part of the Sermon for the Rogation Days.

‘ small Importance to know what the many
 ‘ Writers upon this Subject, since the Time of
 ‘ the Evangelists and Apostles, have affirm’d.’
 The *great* and *good* Archbishop CRANMER
 tells us likewise, in his *Treatise on the Lord’s*
Supper, That ^a ‘ all Doctrine more than this,
 ‘ which is not grounded upon God’s Word, is
 ‘ of no Necessity; neither ought Peoples Heads
 ‘ to be busied, or their Consciences troubled
 ‘ with the same. So that Things spoken and
 ‘ done by Christ, and written by the holy *Evan-*
 ‘ *gelists*, and *St. Paul*, ought to *suffice* the Faith
 ‘ of Christian People, as touching the Doctrine
 ‘ of the Lord’s Supper.’ And, as I have al-
 ready observ’d from him, ‘ the most sure and
 ‘ plain Way is, to cleave unto holy Scripture;’
 and again, ‘ in such wise Credit is to be given to
 ‘ God’s Word *only*, and not to the Word of *any*
 ‘ Man.’ And lastly, as the same Author speaks,
 ‘ No Man ought to be so arrogant and presump-
 ‘ tuous to affirm, for a certain Truth in Religi-
 ‘ on, any Thing which is not spoken of in holy
 ‘ Scripture.’

The Scriptures, as they are a *sufficient*, so
 they ought to be the *only* Rule of our Faith.---
 More particularly with regard to the Lord’s
 Supper; Is it possible *Justin Martyr*, and the
 rest of ‘em, down to *St. Austin*, should know
 what our Saviour did and said at the Time of
 Institution, better than *St. Matthew*, who was
 present at it, *St. Mark* and *St. Luke*, whose
 Hands (if I may so speak) were guided by the

^a Fol. 5. p. 2.

Holy Spirit of God, while they were writing their Accounts of it; or lastly, than St. Paul, who received his Account from *Christ Jesus himself*? I take it for granted therefore, that the four several Accounts, given us in Scripture, of this remarkable Transaction, contain *all* that is necessary to be known about it; to suppose the contrary, is to suppose either that the *sacred* Pen-men were not sufficiently *enabled* by the Holy Ghost, or being able, were not *willing* to give us an exact and just Representation of it. Both which Suppositions it is absolutely impossible a *Christian* should make.--- We must conclude therefore, that in this Case, more especially, what the Practice of Antiquity was, it is of small Importance to know.

Let us proceed therefore, as we proposed, to take into Consideration the Words of Institution.

I. §. When our Lord said, *Τὸτο ποιεῖτε ἐς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, he either did bid them *offer* this (saith the Author of the *Sacrament of the Altar*) or do as he had done. If the first be the Meaning of the Words, there is an End of the Controversy at once: But if the latter, according to this Author, it is the same; because (says he) our Saviour did *offer* up Bread and Wine to God, as Pledges of his natural Body and Blood.----- Let us consider his Proofs distinctly.

In the first Place then he tells us, in general, that *ἀνάμνησις* is the very Action of putting

another in mind, which, in the present Case, is God, not our selves. But how unfortunate at his first setting out ! for surely, he needed not to have been informed, that ἀνάμνησις signifies principally, and mostly the calling to mind, the remembring any Thing; and very seldom putting another in mind. In the next Place he tells us, That it is the same Word which is used in the Mosaic Law for that Part of the Offering where-with the Atonement was made; and for Proof of this, refers us to *Levit. xxiv. 7.* and *Numb. x. 10.* But how unfortunate again ! for the Verse in *Leviticus* runs thus: Καὶ ἐπιθήσει ἐπὶ τὸ θέμα λίβανον καθαρόν ἢ ἄλα, ἢ ἑσνία εἰς ἄβυσσον εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ θυμίου παρὰ κυρίου. ---
And ye shall put upon each Row [of the Shew-bread] pure Frankincense, and Salt: and they shall lay upon the Loaves for a Memorial to the Lord. Here is no mention made of Atonement, or any Thing like it: And in the other Text referred to, it will be found, upon a more narrow Inspection, that the *Blowing of the Trumpets* was the ἀνάμνησις, or Memorial. In this Chapter we read, That *Moses* was commanded to make two silver Trumpets; and the Uses of them are there fully described. And *ver. 9.* we read, *If ye go to war in your Land against the Enemy that oppresseth you, then shall ye blow an Alarm with the Trumpets; and ye shall be remembred before the Lord your God* [Καὶ ἀναμνήσθησθε ἔαυτις κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν] *and ye shall be saved from your Enemies.* And then follows, in *ver. 10.* *Also in the Days of your Gladness, and in your solemn Days, and in the Beginning of your*
D Months,

Months, ye shall blow with your Trumpets over the Burnt-offerings, and over the Sacrifice of your Peace-offerings [*Kai êxai ômlv ἀνάμνησις ἐναντὶ τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν.*] and it shall be a Memorial for you before your God. Our common Translation, indeed, following the present *Hebrew* Copies, renders it otherwise: But this I apprehend to be the true Rendering, according to the *Septuagint*; for, observe the Analogy of Expression in the two Verses, ἀναμνησθήσεσθε ἐναντὶ κυρίου, and êxai ômlv ἀνάμνησις ἐναντὶ τῷ θεῷ, are Phrases of exactly the same Import. The blowing the Trumpets, in the *ninth* Verse, is the ἀνάμνησις; and so likewise, according to the plain literal Interpretation of the Words, is it in the *tenth* Verse. The Word ἀνάμνησις does not occur in any other Place throughout the whole *Pentateuch*; but the Word μνημόσυνον is constantly used in all the Texts referred to in the Margin^p.

To which let me add this Remark, That in both those Places, where ἀνάμνησις is used, there is added either τῷ κυρίῳ, or ἐναντὶ τῷ θεῷ. I conjecture therefore, that if ἀνάμνησις, in the Words of Institution, was intended to signify (as these Authors would persuade us) a Memorial before God, one or the other of these Expressions would have been added: But so it is not; *Ergo*,

The Whole of this Author's Argument runs thus: "When therefore our Lord, yielding

^p Exod. xxviii. 29. *ch.* xxx. 16. Lev. ii. 2, 9, 16. *ch.* v. 12. *ch.* vi. 15. Numb. v. 26. *ch.* xxxi. 54. The same Word is used likewise *Acts* x. 4.

^q Sacrament of the Altar, *p.* 12.

up himself a Sacrifice for us, did say, Do this (which is a sacrificial Term) for a Memorial of me (which is another sacrificial Term) it is manifestly plain, that he did design this Institution for a perpetual Representation of this Sacrifice to God, unless we will depart from the plain, natural, *accustom'd* Sense of the Expression in the *Old Testament*; for to God were all the Memorials under the Law offer'd, by them the Oblation it self was render'd beneficial to the Offerers; and unless we will suppose that our Lord, in ordaining an Institution, should use two known *sacrificial* Terms, and yet not intend a Sacrifice.--- I must take the Liberty to say, that there is hardly a Sentence in this mighty Argument but what is to be rejected, as being either *false* or *unintelligible*. That ἀνάμνησις is not a sacrificial Term, I have prov'd already, except it will be asserted, that the Frankincense and the Salt being put in golden Saucers, and laid upon the Shew-bread, was a Sacrifice; or that blowing Trumpets was a Sacrifice.

If to this it should be objected, that the original *Hebrew* in *Levit. xxiv. 7.* is לְאֹפֶרֶת אֵשׁ זָבַח לְפָנָיו for a Memorial, even an Offering made by Fire (as it is expressed in our *English Translation*) unto the Lord. And that in the *ninth Verse* the Shew-bread is reckon'd among the Offerings made by Fire, because the Frankincense was burnt upon the Altar. I must answer; the Dispute is not about the Meaning of the *Hebrew Word* זָבַח, but the *Greek*, ἀνάμνησις: And it is not said, that it shall be burnt

upon the Altar, only that it shall lay upon the Loaves, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς Κρυΐας. Nay even supposing it had been said, It shall be burnt upon the Altar, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς Κρυΐας, or ἐναντὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ; yet even then it would not come up to the Assertion, That it is used for that Part of the Offering wherewith the *Atonement* was made. For though the Shew-bread, with the Frankincense thereon, is said to be an *Offering* made to the Lord by Fire; yet it is nowhere said to be an Offering for *Sin*; therefore there could be no *Atonement* made by it. Not to mention, that in their *Sin-offerings* they were not to use any Incense^r. *He that sinned shall bring for his Offering the tenth Part of an Ephah of fine Flour for a Sin-offering: He shall put no Oil upon it, neither shall he put Frankincense thereon: For it is a Sin-offering.* Supposing therefore the most that can be supposed; yet still it appears that this Assertion is *false*, viz. That ἀνάμνησις is used for that Part of the Offering wherewith the *Atonement* was made. For though the Frankincense was to be burnt (we will suppose, for Argument's Sake) εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς Κρυΐας, or ἐναντὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ; yet it can never be said to be that Part of the Offering wherewith the *Atonement* was made; because it never was to be used in *Sin-offerings*, neither was the *Shew-bread* a *Sin-offering*.

If it should be urged, That the Merits of the Cause do not lay in this, viz. whether the Word be taken in the exact Sense of that Part

^r Levit. v. 11;

of the Offering, wherewith the *Atonement* was made; but the main Thing to be considered is, whether the Word does signify a *Memorial to God*. I must answer,

1. That there seems some Design to be served by asserting, that it is used for that Part of the Offering wherewith the *Atonement* was made. For we have seen above, that this Author has asserted the Lord's Supper to be a Sacrifice *Propitiatory*, or by which *Atonement* is made before God for our Sins; and therefore it is, that I have taken such particular Notice of the Expression; for the Argument that is slyly insinuated in these Words seems to be this.

Ἀνάμνησις is that Part of the Offering wherewith *Atonement* was made.

Our Lord has commanded us to do this, *ὡς ἀνάμνησιν*.

Ergo, By it *Atonement* is made.

2. The Reason why *ἀνάμνησις* is not to be understood as a *Memorial to God* in the Words of Institution, I have given above, p. 16.

But to go on.---- To talk of the *accustomed* Sense of an Expression, which occurs but *twice*, is to talk a little *odly*; I will not say it was done with a *Design* to IMPOSE upon the Reader. Then what is distinctly meant by this Expression, 'To God were *all* the Memorials under the Law offer'd,' I do not so fully apprehend; for if we consult the Texts referred to in the Margin *, we shall find several Things ap-

* Exod. iii. 15. ch. xii. 14. ch. xiii. 9. ch. xvii. 14. ch. xxviii. 17. Numb. xvi. 40. Joshua iv. 7.

pointed to be *Memorials* to the Children of *Israel*. Neither will I say that this was a *Design* to IMPOSE upon the Reader, but it looks very much like it: for it seems to insinuate, that a *Memorial* in the very Notion of it *as such*, implies a *Sacrifice* ^t. If it should be said, That the following Words, *by them the Oblation it self, &c.* do shew what *Memorials* the Author means, I must acknowledge the Discovery is *wonderful*, and we are indebted to him for informing us in so *important* a Point, and letting us know that *all* the *Memorials* that were offer'd to God, were *indeed* offer'd to God: But in this Place it was quite impertinent. But further,

Πίστω, he tells us, is a *sacrificial* Term, without any Limitation (these are his Words, when our Lord said, *Do this*, which is a *sacrificial* Term, &c.) But surely! it is not always to be taken in that Sense; this is not the *only* or *ori-*

^t This has been asserted by a late Author. 'It is no Argument, *saith he*, against *The Lord's Supper being a Sacrifice*, to say it is a *Memorial*, and therefore no *Sacrifice*. For amongst the *Jews* we find that the most consecrated Part of the *Sacrifice* is called a *Memorial*—— This Objection rather helps us; for it proves at least, that the Lord's Supper is nevertheless a *Sacrifice* for being a *Memorial*.' But in this, this Author has either mistaken the Point, or begged the Question. For in the first Place we say, because the Lord's Supper is appointed to be a *Memorial to us*, therefore it is not a *Sacrifice*; whereas he seems to insinuate, that we hold it to be a *Memorial to God*. In the next Place, his arguing that it is a *Sacrifice* because it is a *Memorial to God*, is a direct begging the Question; for, What is this more than to say, It is a *Sacrifice* because it is a *Sacrifice*? Dr. Brett likewise mistakes in the same Manner, p. 67. when he says, 'It is plain that a *Memorial* may be an *Oblation*: Whereas this Gentleman [the Author of *The Plain Account*] would intimate, that because it is a *Memorial*, it cannot be an *Oblation*.'

ginal Meaning of the Word. No! this he cannot say; for it is only a borrow'd *metaphorical* Sense. Ποίω, as every School-boy can inform him, signifies to *do*, to *make* any Thing; and your nicer Critics tell you, *Proprieè significat rem aliquam certis qualitatibus ornare; dicitur enim à nomine ποιῶ, qualis*. And whenever it is used as a *sacrificial* Term, there is always something to pin it down to that Meaning; so that it would be an *Absurdity* to render it otherwise, v. gr. *Exod. xxix. 38. Ταύτα ἔτι θὰ ποιῶσαι ἐπὶ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ. This is that which thou shalt offer upon the Altar*. Now suppose any one should translate it thus: This is that which thou shalt *do* upon the Altar: What was it they were to do upon the Altar but to *offer* the Lambs? &c. So likewise in *Latin*, the Word *facio* bears the same Interpretation. *Sacra facio*, or *sacrificio*, every one knows the Meaning of; but may we assert for that Reason, that *facio* is indefinitely a *sacrificial* Term? And to *do* Sacrifice is a common Phrase in *English*; but are we to say, that therefore *do* is a *sacrificial* Term?---- I say therefore, that ποιῶ is *not* to be understood as a *sacrificial* Term but when it is joined with other Words which pin it down to that Meaning; so that it would be an *Absurdity* to render it otherwise. But thus it is not in the Words of Institution. *Ergo*,

If it should be said, that the Author of the *Sacrament of the Altar* has already disprov'd the *Minor* of this Argument, p. 26. of his Book; where speaking of 1 Cor. xi. 25. he saith, Ποίω signifies either to *make* or to *offer*:
 ' Now,

‘ Now, I suppose, no one will imagine that our
 ‘ Saviour could say, *Make* this, (the Wine) as
 ‘ often as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me;
 ‘ and therefore the plain *English* of τῶλο ποιεῖτε,
 ‘ both in *Luke* xxii. 19. and here, in *1 Cor.*
 ‘ xi. 25. is, *Offer* this (the Cup) as oft as ye
 ‘ drink it, in Remembrance of me. And thus
 ‘ the Word is pinned down to the Sense of *Of-*
 ‘ *fering* to avoid the *Absurdity* of supposing our
 ‘ Saviour could bid them *make* the Cup “, &c.
 And if ποιεῖτε, when apply’d to the Cup, can-
 not, without an *Absurdity*, be understood other-
 wise than in the Sense of *Offering*; it must of
 Consequence be understood in the same Sense,
 when apply’d to the Bread.---- I say, if this
 should be objected, I reply thus :

1. That there is no *Absurdity* in the Para-
 phrase of this Verse, given us by the Author of
The Plain Account, which is this : *As often as*
ye shall meet together to drink Wine professedly for
this Purpose, Take Care that ye always do it, not
as drinking at a common Meal, but in a religious
Remembrance of me. To this it is objected,
 by the Author of the *Sacrament of the Altar*,
 and Dr. Brett, as if it were an idle Tautology;
 for, say they, this is, in plain Terms, as often
 as ye shall meet together to drink Wine in Re-
 membrance of me,--- Take Care that ye drink
 it in Remembrance of me.

In answer to which, let me remind these
 Authors, that it is common with every Man to
 express a *Caution* against disobeying or misun-

“ See likewise Dr. Brett, p. 83.

derstanding his Injunctions, by a *Repetition* of what he had before said, and consider'd in this Light, it is far from being a *Tautology*, or deserving that Name.---- But if this will not suffice, then,

2. Let what I just now observ'd be remember'd, viz. *Ποτὴν Propriè significat rem aliquam certis qualitatibus ornare; dicitur enim à nemine τὴν qualis*; and may we not accordingly paraphrase this Text thus? *As often as ye shall meet together to drink Wine in Remembrance of me: Do this* (observe not *make*, but *do this*) *to the Cup, that I have done to it, i. e. Take the Cup, separate it from common Use, and bless it.* Now is there any *Absurdity* in all this? Why then must we be obliged to render it *Offer* this?

Here our *sacrificing* Adversaries will be ready to reply, and say, If we are to do what our Saviour did at his last Supper to the *Bread* and *Wine*, we must *offer* them up in Sacrifice to Almighty God; because our Lord *then* gave or *offered* to God *Bread* and *Wine* as Pledges of his natural Body and Blood, and commanded his Apostles to give, or *offer* to God *Bread* and *Wine*, as Figures of his Body and Blood, to bring the grand Sacrifice into Remembrance before God. Their Argument to prove this runs thus: * Our Lord says, *This is my Body given for you; this is my Blood shed for you.* He speaks in the present Tense, διδόντες ἐκχυνόμενοι, what he gave to his Disciples,

* Sacrament of the Altar, p. 12.

' that he first gave for them ; for of that which
' he gave to them he said : *This is my Body*
' *given for you ; this is my Blood poured out for*
' *you.*'---

I answer, That the same Way of Argumentation will equally serve to prove, that what our Saviour gave to his Disciples, was his *natural* Body and Blood. For to this Argument, drawn from *διδόμενον* and *ἐχυνόμενον*, being in the present Tense, let us but reply, as we would to a *Papist* labouring to prove the *absurd* Doctrine of Transubstantiation from the Words of Institution, and we shall presently see how inconclusive it is. For this Argument is founded upon a *supposed* Necessity of interpreting the Words *literally*. And if such a Necessity there be, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation stands upon a firm and lasting Foundation, even as firm as the Doctrine of the *Trinity* : And all the seeming Absurdities that are objected against it, are to be solved in the same Way as the Objections of *Socinians* and *Infidels* against the *Trinity*. And this following Argument, (upon a *supposed* Necessity of interpreting the Words *literally*) is strictly conclusive.

What he gave for them, that he gave to them.

But it was his *natural* Body he gave for them.

Ergo, It was his *natural* Body he gave to them.----

The *Minor* is to be proved as from other Passages of Scripture ; so especially from those
cited

cited in the Margin ^w. And the *Major* (if the Words of Institution must be understood *literally*) is, and ever will be eternally true, as is evident to every one (I trust) at Sight.---- And the only *rational* Answer to this Argument, is that made Use of in *The Plain Account*, p. 17. viz. ' This is particularly to be observed, That the whole Tenor and Form of this Institution is in the *figurative* Way of Speaking : And that all Expressions in it of the same Sort, ought to be understood in the same Manner, For Instance ; the *Cup*, in the Words recorded by St. *Luke* and St. *Paul*, is allowed not to signify the *Cup*, but the *Wine* in the *Cup*. This *Wine* is allowed by all not to be it self the *new Covenant* ; nor to be changed (or transubstantiated) into the *new Covenant* ; but only to be the *Memorial* of the *new Covenant*. If therefore the *Cup*, in the Words of Institution, be not the *Cup*, but the *Wine* in it ; if the *Wine* in it be not it self the *new Covenant*, though declared expressly to be so, as the *Bread* is declared to be Christ's Body, or the *Wine* his Blood : It follows, &c.---

Or if this Author, through the evil Prejudices of the Times, is not to be heard and attended to ; let us listen to what the *great* and *good* Archbishop CRANMER saith in relation to this Point. * ' Why should any Man think it strange, to admit a *Figure* in these Speeches, seeing that the Communication, the same

^w Gal. i. 4. *ch.* ii. 10. Ephes. v. 2, 25. Col. i. 22. 1 Tim. ii. 6. Tit. ii. 14. Heb. i. 3. *ch.* vii. 27. *ch.* ix. 14, 26. *ch.* x. 10.
^z Treatise on the Lord's Supper, fol. 73.

' Night, was so full of *figurative* Speeches?---
 ' When Christ said, This Cup is a New Testa-
 ' ment in my Blood, here, in one Sentence, be
 ' two *Figures*. One in this Word *Cup*, which
 ' is not taken for the *Cup* it self, but for the
 ' Thing contained in the *Cup*. Another is in
 ' this Word *Testament*; for neither the Cup,
 ' nor the Wine contained in the Cup, is Christ's
 ' *Testament*, but is a Token, Sign, and Figure,
 ' whereby is represented unto us his *Testament*,
 ' confirmed by his Blood.'

But farther.--- We are told, y ' That when
 ' Christ said, *This is my Body given for you*, he
 ' plainly means, given, or *offered* to God for
 ' you, and by consequence he did then give,
 ' or *offer* to God the Bread and Wine, as
 ' Pledges of his Body and Blood.--- Again.---
 ' If our Lord called the Bread which he had
 ' blessed, or consecrated, *his Body given for*
 ' *them*, it is plain, that he gave or offered it as
 ' his Body to God; for what he called his Body,
 ' that he gave to God for them: *This is my*
 ' *Body given for you*. Our Saviour therefore
 ' does, as plainly as he can, declare that he gave,
 ' or offered *himself*, his natural Body and Blood,
 ' to God for them, under the Pledges of Bread
 ' and Wine.'

Here are two Consequences pretty widely di-
 stant from each other, drawn from the same
 Premises with which, so far as I can discern,
 they have no Manner of Connection. *First*, Be-
 cause our Saviour says of the Bread, *This is my*

Body given for you, it is concluded, that he gave, or *offered* the *Bread* to God for them; and thus the Participle, *given*, is made to refer to the *Bread*. And in the next Place, from the same Words it is concluded, that he *gave* his *natural Body* to God for them at that Time; and thus the Participle, *given*, is made to refer to the *Body* of Christ. Sure! this is a very *uncouth* Manner of Construction. But to pass by this.---- Instead of these Words of St. *Luke*, let us put down those made Use of by St. *Paul*, as the Premises, and see what Conclusion can be drawn from thence. Now he informs us, 'That when our Saviour delivered the Bread to the Disciples, he said, *This is my Body which is BROKEN for you*. And may we conclude from hence, That Christ's Body was at this Time actually *broken*, by arguing as these Authors do from the Word *given*; our Saviour speaking in the *present Tense*, *is broken, now broken*, it plainly appears that he did, some how or other, *break* his Body? But, for a full Confutation of all *such* kind of Arguments, I must refer these Authors, once more, to *The Plain Account*, and Archbishop CRANMER.

2. §. We have been told, That the Doctrine of a representative *Sacrifice* in the Lord's Supper will appear from the *Reason*, and *Nature* of the Thing it self. In order to prove which, we have a strange unaccountable Definition of a religious Duty given us, which, to me, is entirely new, and which, I believe, is peculiarly this Author's *own*. Thus he argues; * ' All

* Sacrament of the Altar, p. 15, 16.

' Sorts of People, who call themselves Christi-
 ' ans, except the Quakers, do hold the Sacra-
 ' ment of the Lord's Supper to be a *religious*
 ' *Duty*; and if it be a *religious Duty*, it must
 ' be perform'd *to, and before God*, as all other
 ' *religious Duties* are; and consequently the
 ' Commemoration, and Representation of our
 ' Lord's Death and Passion, made in this Ordi-
 ' nance, must be made *to, and before God*,
 ' otherwise it has not the Nature of a *religious*
 ' *Duty*. If therefore we will allow, that this
 ' Ordinance is a *religious Duty*; it is apparently
 ' manifest, that when our Lord commanded
 ' and commissioned his Apostles--- to make a
 ' *Memorial* of him, he commanded them to
 ' make a *Memorial to God*,' &c. This Argu-
 ment reduced to Form, stands thus:

A religious Duty is perform'd to, and before God.

The Commemoration of Christ's Death in the Lord's Supper, is a religious Duty.

Ergo, The Commemoration of Christ's Death in the Lord's Supper is perform'd to, and before God.----

In return for this, I'll give him another *Syllogism*.

A religious Duty is perform'd to, and before God.

Giving Bread to the Hungry, and Drink to the Thirsty, is a religious Duty:

Ergo, Giving Bread to the Hungry, and Drink to the Thirsty, is perform'd to, and before God:---- But what Man of Sense would talk in so wild a Manner!

3. §. The Practice of Antiquity I have nothing to do with.--- And---

4. §. The Sense of our own Church is evident, as from that Passage of the Homily, quoted in the Preface of *The Sacrament of the Altar*; 'We must take heed, lest of the *Memory* 'it be made a *Sacrifice*:' So likewise from the Prayer of Consecration, wherein are these Words: '*Jesus Christ* did institute, and in his 'holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual *Memory* of that his precious Death, until 'his coming again.--- And grant that *we*, *receiving* these thy Creatures of Bread and Wine, 'according to thy Son our Saviour *Jesus Christ's* 'holy Institution, in *Remembrance* of his Death 'and Passion,' &c.--- And in the Exhortation to be used at the Time of Celebration:--- 'To 'the End that WE SHOULD ALWAYS REMEMBER the exceeding great Love of our Master, 'and only Saviour *Jesus Christ*, thus dying for 'us, and the innumerable Benefits which, by 'his precious Blood-shedding, he hath obtained 'to us; he hath instituted and ordained holy 'Mysteries as Pledges of his Love, and for a 'continual *Remembrance* of his Death, to our 'great and endless Comfort.'---- Again.---- In the Form at the Delivery of the *Bread*^a: 'Take and eat this in *Remembrance* that *Christ*

^a I believe the Reader will, upon comparing these Forms with the Words of Institution, readily conclude with me, that they were design'd to express the Meaning of (and were appointed to be used in Imitation of our Saviour, when he said *Τῆς ᾧ ἐστὶν τὸ εἶναι ἐν ἑμὶν*. *Do this in Remembrance of me.*

‘died for thee.’--- So likewise, at the Delivery of the *Cup*, ‘Drink this in *Remembrance* that ‘*Christ’s* Blood was shed for thee.

Hence, I think, it is plain to *Demonstration*, that our Church understands the Word ἀνάμνησις, in the Form of Institution, not to signify a *Memorial to God*; but to refresh our *own* Memories. And if ἀνάμνησις does not refer to God, which, beside the Authority of our Church, I have already given sufficient Proof of; then neither does προσφέρει signify *offer*, as is evident at Sight; and will, I believe, readily be allow’d even by our *sacrificing* Adversaries themselves.

But besides these already produced, there are more Testimonies of our Church, in Proof that ἀνάμνησις does not refer to God but to *our selves*. The Homily of the worthy receiving the Sacrament, begins thus:--- ‘The great ‘Love of our Saviour *Christ* to Mankind, doth ‘not only appear in that dear-bought Benefit of ‘our Redemption and Salvation by his Death ‘and Passion; but also in that he so kindly ‘provided that the same most merciful Work ‘*might be had in continual Remembrance to take ‘some Place in us*, and not be frustrate of his ‘End and Purpose. For as tender Parents are ‘not content to procure for their Children, costly Possessions and Livelihood, but take Order, ‘that the same may be conserved, and come to ‘their Use: So our Lord and Saviour thought it ‘not sufficient to purchase for us his Father’s ‘Favour again (which is that deep Fountain of all Goodness and eternal Life) but also invented ‘the Ways most wisely, whereby they might
‘redound

redound to our Commodity and Profit. Amongst the which Means is the *publick Celebration of the Memory of his Death*, at the Lord's Table. Which, although it seem of small Virtue to some, yet, being rightly done by the Faithful, it doth not only help their Weakness (who by their poisoned Nature, are readier to *remember* Injuries than Benefits) but strengtheneth and comforteth their inward Man with Peace and Gladness, and maketh them thankful to their Redeemer, with diligent Care and godly Conversation. And as of old Time, God decreed his wondrous Benefits of the Deliverance of his People, *to be kept in Memory by eating of the Passover*, with his Rites and Ceremonies: So our loving Saviour hath ordained, and established the *Remembrance* of his great Mercy, expressed in his Passion, in the Institution of his heavenly Supper, &c. I thought proper to transcribe this Passage entire, because it is so full against the Doctrine of the *Sacrificers*. And in my Opinion, the Man who after all this can assert, that the Church of *England* teaches the Lord's Supper to be a *Sacrifice*, and that she has order'd it to be celebrated *as such*, must have a Face of true *Corinthian*.

But this is not the only Point in which these *truly Orthodox* Men, as they fancy themselves to be, contradict the *establish'd Doctrine* of the Church of *England*; that Doctrine which they have *subscrib'd*, and declar'd their Assent to. For if we proceed to examine that which is the very Foundation of their *Hypothesis*, we

shall find them making Use of the very Words of SOCINUS; and laying that down as a fundamental Principle, which is one of his *distinguishing* Tenets. For the Satisfaction therefore of the Reader, before I proceed to shew the Falsty of this their Principle, I will set down in one Column the Words of these *Sacrificers*, and in an opposite one, those of SOCINUS, that it may be seen, at one View, how *awkwardly* their ORTHODOXY fits upon them.

That *Christ* offered himself, is certain; the Author of this Epistle [to the *Hebrews*] teaches us so very plainly; but that this Offering was made upon the Cross, he no where saith. Brett, p. 59.

The *Maſtation* of him was indeed perform'd upon the Cross; but the *Oblation* of him was begun before, carried on, and not ended till he enter'd into the Holy of Holies, and there *presented* or

Prius illud monuerimus veram oblationem expiatoriam corporis Christi, quam auctor ad Heb. Sacrificiis illis legalibus opponit, non esse ipsius Christi mortem; sed per mortem ingressum in cælum, ubi nunc pro nobis coram Deo apparet. Socin. Oper. Vol. II. p. 162. Edit. 1656.

Quemadmodum legalis sacerdos in Sacrificio illo anniversario, quancvis non prius in sancta sanctorum ingredi posset, quam hostias pro peccato extra mactasset, sanguinem tamen ipsarum hostiarum in sacrarium offer'd

offer'd up himself to
God for us. Bowyer,
p. 38.

Christ did not, properly speaking, offer himself on the Cross; though he was as a Sacrifice slain on the Cross, and this Sacrifice was not, properly speaking, finished, not only till after he was so slain, but even not till after he was ascended into the Presence of God. *Sacrament of the Altar*, p. 49.

inferre debebat, & ibi coram Deo expiationem quæ eo sanguine fiebat, peragere: sic Christus, quamvis seipsum hostiam pro peccatis nostris mactandam tradere debuerit, antequam in cælum ingrederetur: se tamen, per quem expiatio perficienda erat, coram Deo in ipso cælo deinde pro nobis sistere, & ibi nostrorum peccatorum expiationem peragere debuit. Id. ibid. p. 174.

Assero eum non obtulisse seipsum nisi per mortem, i. e. non nisi morte interveniente, quamvis oblatio non ante perfecta fuerit, quam post resurrectionem, & ascensum ipsius in cælum, p. 166. Rectum est, immo necessarium, ut non ante acta fuerit expiatio, quam is in cælum assumptus sit.---- Verum est, expiationem peccatorum nostrorum antequam Christus in cælum ingrederetur peractam non fuisse, p. 174.

These are they that set themselves up for *Standards of Orthodoxy*, and have accus'd a Right Reverend Prelate of our Church of *Socinianism*! These are they that would be thought true Sons of the Church of ENGLAND, at the same Time that they are inculcating one of the most *Pernicious* of SOCINUS's Principles, in direct Opposition to the *authentic* Declarations of our Church! which may be seen at one View by the following Scheme of the Doctrine of

*The Church of England,
and of*

We must trust only in God's Mercy, and the Sacrifice which our High-Priest and Saviour *Jesus Christ*, the Son of God *once offered upon the Cross*. Book of Hom. p. 16.

There is none other Work, that can be named under Heaven, to save our Souls, but this only Work of *Christ's* precious *Offering of his Body upon the Altar of the Cross*. B. of Hom. p. 265.

Christ, by his own Oblation, and once Of-

These Sacrificers.

Christ did *not*, properly speaking, offer himself upon the Cross. Sacrament of the Altar, p. 49.

It does not appear that *Christ* offered himself upon the Cross. Brett, p. 62.

The Cross was so far from being the Altar upon which *Christ* offered himself, that he rather offered himself up before. Bowyer, p. 50.

It does not appear that he made any Oblation

fering of himself upon the Cross. Ibid. p. 273.

Almighty God! our heavenly Father, who of thy great Mercy didst give thine only Son *Jesus Christ* to suffer Death upon the Cross for our Redemption, who made *there* [i. e. upon the Cross] by his one Oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, &c.

Prayer of Consecration in the Communion Office.

Of the one Oblation of *Christ finished upon the Cross.* Title of Article XXXI.

lation of himself here on Earth, but what he made in the holy Eucharist. *Brett*, p. 65.

This Sacrifice was not, properly speaking, *finished*, not only till after he was so slain, but even not till after he was ascended into the Presence of God. *Sacrament of the Altar*, p. 49.

The Oblation of him was not ended till he enter'd into the Holy of Holies, and there presented or offered up himself to God for us. *Bowyer*, p. 38.

He

He hath made upon his Cross a full and sufficient Sacrifice for Thee, a perfect Cleansing of thy Sins : and herein thou needest no other Sacrifice or Oblation, no sacrificing Priest. *Book of Hom.* p. 284.

Christ commended to his Church a Sacrament of his Body and Blood : They have changed it into a SACRIFICE. *Id.* p. 295.

This Representative Sacrifice is PROPITIATORY. *Preface to the Sacrament of the Altar.* And p. 58, the Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist is a *Sin-offering*, a propitiatory Oblation. See the *Sacrament of the Altar*, Brett and Bowyer's *Answers to The Plain Account, as to their main Drift and Design.*

Thus we see how directly contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, the Doctrine of these *Sacrificers* is (not to mention how consonant it is on the other Hand to the Doctrine of *Socinus*) to which let me add, that it is contrary likewise to the Doctrine contained in one of their favourite *primitive* Liturgies (as they call them;) for in that ascribed to St. *James*, there is a Prayer, the Title of which is ; *Εὐχή τῆς θυμιάματος τῆς εἰσόδου τῆς ἐκείνης* and the Prayer begins thus : *Δέσποτα Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ὁ θεὸς λόγος, ὁ ἐκ σοῦ ἐκείνης θυσίαν ἀμωμον ΕΠΙ ΣΤΑΥΡΟΥ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ προσάγαλόν. κ. τ. λ.* O ! our Lord and Master Jesus Christ the Word of God, who willingly offered thy self UPON THE CROSS a spotless Sacrifice to God, even the Father, &c.---

But let me observe withal, that I may not be charged with an Absurdity in urging Authority, which I my self have rejected, that I do not produce this as *proper* Authority, only as *argumentum ad hominem*: And if some Persons had thought of this while they were writing against *The Plain Account*, they would not have been so *archly* severe upon the Author for citing a Passage out of *Chrysostom*, and mentioning *ancient* Interpreters.---- To proceed.----

The Question is; Whether *Christ* offered himself upon the Cross, or elsewhere? Our *sacrificing* Adversaries, in perfect Harmony with SOCINUS, so far as relates to this Point, are *unanimous*, that *he did not offer himself upon the Cross*; they *differ* indeed a little as to the particular Time and Place, when and where he performed this *Oblation*: SOCINUS saith, in Heaven, *after* his Crucifixion; the Sacrificers at his last Supper, *before* he was fasten'd to the Cross. But this, as I said before, they are unanimous in, that *he did not offer himself upon the Cross*.--- I, on the contrary, assert with the Church of *England*, (*thrice* in her Homilies, and *once* in her Liturgy, she does *expressly* assert it, and, upon Examination, will be found in several other Places, more than to imply the same Truth) that *Christ* did truly, and properly speaking, *offer himself upon the ALTAR of the Cross*.

The Sum of what they say in Defence of their *Hypothesis*, is this^b: 'That under the

^b Sacrament of the Altar, p. 46.

48 *The LORD'S SUPPER*

' Law the Sacrifice was offered to God *before*
 ' it was slain, though the Oblation was not *fi-*
 ' *nished* till *after* it was, the Atonement being
 ' made by the Blood of the slain Animal. So
 ' *Christ* offered himself to God, *i. e.* N. B. *re-*
 ' *signed* himself to God, to be slain on the Cross,
 ' *before* he was fasten'd to the Cross. That he
 ' solemnly offer'd himself to God under the
 ' Pledges of Bread and Wine in the *Eucharist*.
 ' That in giving or offering the Bread and Wine
 ' to God, he did in his own *Intention* offer,
 ' and resign up his Body and Blood as a Sacri-
 ' fice for the Sins of Men: For when he admi-
 ' nister'd the Bread to the Apostles, he did ex-
 ' pressly declare this Bread to be his Body *given*,
 ' or offered to God for them. ^a He said, 'This
 ' is my Body *given*; not that *shall be*, but *now*
 ' *given*, or offer'd to God for you: He there-
 ' fore made the *Oblation* of himself, when he
 ' instituted the *Eucharist*.'---

Again.--- ^c *Heb. ix. 28.* ' *Christ* was offer'd
 ' To bear the Sins of many. But he bare our
 ' Sins in his own Body *on* the Tree, 1 *Pet.*
 ' *ii. 24.* therefore the *Offering* must precede the
 ' *Bearing*, *i. e.* He was offer'd *to* bear our Sins
 ' *on* the Cross, *before* he was fasten'd to the
 ' Cross. ^f That to offer is to perform an *Action*,
 ' but to *bear* is to be *passive*. Now *Christ* was
 ' *active*, performed a solemn Action when he
 ' celebrated the *Eucharist*, but perfectly *passive*

^c *Sacrament of the Altar, p. 15.*

^d *Bowyer, p. 38. Brett, p. 75.*

^e *Bowyer, p. 49. Brett, p. 59.*

^f *Idem. p. 62.*

‘when he was *crucified*.’---- Let us distinctly take into Consideration each of these Particulars.

First then it is said, ‘That under the Law the Sacrifice was offered *before* it was slain.’ Now this is asserted in direct Opposition to what GOD HIMSELF saith to *Moses*, *Exod. xxix. 38.* *This is that which thou shalt OFFER UPON THE ALTAR; two Lambs of the first Year, Day by Day, continually.* For surely! they were not offered upon the Altar before they were slain. If to this our Adversaries should oppose *Levit. i. 3. iii. 1, 2. iv. 14.* wherein, according to our *English Translation*, the *Offering* is supposed and declared to precede the *Slaying* of the Animals, I must observe, that this *Offering*, as it is called in our *English Translation*, mentioned in these Places, is not, properly speaking, the *Oblation* in the sacrificial Sense of that Word, but rather a *Dedication*, or *Consecration* of them in Order to be offered afterwards: and if we con-

Though Dr. Outram is pleased to say, *Tum offerebatur vittima, cum ante aram fistebatur, lib. ii. cap. iii. §. 2.* yet let the judicious Reader determine, whether he does not express himself more accurately, when treating of the Rites and Ceremonies to be used before the slaying of the Animal, he saith, *lib. i. cap. xv. sub fine. De eis (ritibus) agimus, quibus victima ante aram statim Sacrandæ, ac devovenda fuit.* I observe farther, that in Order to support this Opinion of the Oblation’s preceding the Maſtation, he saith, *lib. i. cap. xv. §. 4. Ego facile in Sacrificiis duplicem agnosco Oblationem, imò verò in ipsis sacris literis duplicem passim poni video, alteram victimæ adhuc viventis, alteram sanguinis & ablegminum; seu majoris alteram mox maſtandæ alteram jam maſtatæ victimæ.* Which whoever shall assert concerning the Oblation of Christ, will flatly contradict the express Words of holy Writ. For, as it is appointed unto Men once to die, but after this the Judgment; so Christ was once offer’d (and never more than once) to bear the Sins of many, *Heb. ix. 27, 28.*

sult the Original, we shall find it so to be; for *Lev. i. 3.* in the Original stands thus:

אם עלה קרבנו מזֶבֶקֶר וְכֹר הַמִּיֹּם יִקְרִיבֵנו אֶל פֶּתַח
 אֹהֶל מִעֵד יִקְרִיב אֹתוֹ *If his Offering be a burnt
 Sacrifice of the Herd, he shall^h BRING a Male
 without blemish: to the Door of the Tabernacle
 of the Congregation shall he bring it.----* And
 the same Word which in this Verse our Tran-
 slators had not so well translated *offer*, in *ver. 5.*
 they have rightly translated *bring*. *The Priests,
 Aaron's Sons, shall BRING the Blood, and
 sprinkle the Blood round about upon the Altar.*
 The same Word is used likewise in those Verses
 cited from *Lev. iii.* and *iv.* so that this can be
 of no Service to them, it being impossible to be
 made appear from these Places, that the Ani-
 mal was, properly speaking, *offered before* it was
 slain. Mr. Bowyer indeed is pleased to sayⁱ,
 that all the Sacrifices were first offered whilst
 alive, and then *slain upon the Altar*. But in
 this, I believe, his Colleagues will give him up,
 it being *absolutely and evidently* wrong at first
 Sight. For they did *not* *slay* the Animal *upon*
the Altar; but having first killed it in some
 other Place, the *Blood*, or some other Part of
 it, was brought to the *Altar*, and there poured
 out, or sprinkled, or consumed in the Fire up-
 on the Altar: and THIS was, properly speak-
 ing, the *Oblation*, which was not, as these Au-
 thors would persuade us, the *Beginning*, but

^h קָרַב in *Kal* appropinquavit, in *Hiphil* הִקְרִיב appropia-
 quare fecit.

ⁱ Page 38.

the *Conclusion* of that religious Service. It (the Oblation, properly so called in the sacrificial Sense of the Word) consisting in the Blood of the slain Animal being poured out, or sprinkled *upon the Altar*, or the Carcase, or some Part of it, being burnt *thereupon*. This will evidently appear from a Perusal of the Book of *Leviticus*, and therefore there is no Occasion to be tedious in multiplying Quotations.---- And this there is the less Necessity to enlarge upon, because the Author of the *Sacrament of the Altar* has expressly owned it, p. 38. in these Words, (though in flat Contradiction to what he afterwards asserts, p. 49.) ‘ If the Symbols
‘ of Bread and Wine are to be *offered* to God,
‘ as the Representatives of *Christ’s* Body and
‘ Blood, then *that on which they are offered, not*
‘ *only may be, but properly is called an Altar;*
‘ for N. B. what is the *peculiar* Purpose of an
‘ *Altar, but to offer thereupon* ^k ?

What has led these Authors into this Mistake of asserting, that under the Law the Sacrifice was *offered before it was slain*; and has put them upon contradicting the Doctrine of our Church (for her Doctrine is, as I have already shewed, that *Christ offered himself upon the Altar of the Cross*) is their using the Word *offer* in such a vague indeterminate Sense. *Christ* offered himself, *i. e.* (say they) he *resigned* himself to be slain on the Cross, before he was fastened to it. But in the Name of Criticism! Does the Word

^k This is again repeated three times, p. 45, 46, 47. Mr. Bowyer saith likewise the same, p. 46.

offer, when it is used as a *sacrificial* Term, signify the same as to *resign*? If it does, then I affirm, he *offered* himself in the *Garden*, when *Judas*, with the Multitude, approached to take him: for *then* it was that he *resigned* himself up to be slain. He could have prayed to his Father, and he should presently have given him more than twelve Legions of Angels to have rescued him out of the Hands of his Enemies; but instead of this, he patiently *resigned* himself up to *their* Will. And let it be observed, that here was more than an *intentional*, here was an *actual* Resignation of himself to be slain on the Cross: and if this *Resignation* is to be called the *Oblation* of *Christ*, it was performed in the *Garden*, *after* his eating the *Passover*, and instituting the *Lord's Supper*, not *at* the very Time of Institution.

If to this it should be objected, that our Saviour, before he went into the *Garden*, and probably immediately after instituting the *Lord's Supper*, in that solemn Prayer to the Father recorded *John xvii.* saith, *I have FINISHED the Work, which thou gavest me to do.* But his offering himself up as a Sacrifice to God, was the greatest Work he had to do here on Earth; and therefore *before* he began this Address to God, he must have *offered* himself. I say, if this should be objected, I reply, That his *actually* laying down his Life as a Ransom for the Sins of the whole World, was, as it is termed in the Objection, the *greatest* Work he had to do here on Earth. If therefore this Objection proves any Thing, it proves too much; and for
this

this Reason it is plain, that our Saviour meant this of *that Work only*, which God had given him to do as a *Prophet*. This he had certainly *finished*; but he had not yet put away Sin by the *Sacrifice* of himself.

In the next Place it is said, that Christ made the *Oblation* of himself, when he instituted the Eucharist; because, when he administer'd the Bread to his Disciples, he did expressly declare this Bread to be his Body *given* for them. He said, *This is my Body given*; not that *shall be*, but *now given*, or *offer'd* to God for you.---- This Argument drawn from a suppos'd Necessity of interpreting the Words of Institution *literally*, I have given a sufficient Answer to already, p. 22, 23. and to avoid Repetition, thither I refer the Reader.

In the third Place,---- *Heb. ix. 28. 1 Pet. ii. 24. Christ was offer'd to bear the Sins of many: He bare our Sins in his own Body on the Tree.* From whence it is concluded, that the *Offering* must precede the *Bearing*. Yes! it must so perhaps in the Order of our *Ideas*, but not in point of Time; for the *true* and *full* Meaning of these Texts may, I conceive, be express'd in these Words: *He bare our Sins in his own Body, by being offer'd on the Tree.*---- Christ was *offer'd* (say they) *to* bear our Sins on the Cross, *before* he actually did bear them on the Cross, *i. e.* before he was fasten'd to the Cross. Here again the Word *offered* is us'd in a very loose improper Sense. If they mean that Christ *resign'd* himself up to be slain *before* he actually was slain; Who denies it? or who
ever

ever did? But if they mean, that he was *offer'd* up [in the *sacrificial* Sense of that Word, or] as a *Sacrifice* to God, *before* he was fasten'd to the Cross; I do say, they flatly contradict *Heb. ix. 25, 26, 27, 28.* and *x.* from the Beginning to the End of the *fourteenth* Verse. This will appear to any *unprejudiced* Person at first Sight. For from *Heb. ix. 25, 26.* and *Heb. x. 5, 10.* compar'd, it is evident that the *Offering* of Christ in the *scriptural* Sense of the Term, is the same as the *Sacrifice* of HIMSELF, *i. e.* of his Body, his *real Flesh and Blood*. And though it is no where said in Scripture in so many Words, that Christ *offered* himself *upon the Cross*: Yet it may, by *plain* and *necessary* Consequence, be drawn from hence.

Lastly, It is said, 'That to *offer* is to perform an *Action*, but to *bear* is to be *passive*. 'Now Christ was *active*, performed a solemn *Action*, when he instituted the Eucharist, but 'perfectly *passive* when he was crucified.' In Answer to this, I only beg leave to remind these Gentlemen of the Words of our blessed Saviour himself. *John x. 15, 17, 18. I lay down my Life for the Sheep. Therefore doth the Father love me, because I lay down my Life, that I might take it again. NO MAN TAKETH IT FROM ME, BUT I LAY IT DOWN OF MYSELF.* Which Words are a full Confutation of all that simple Talk, which Dr. Brett has transcribed from Mr. Johnson of Christ's being wholly passive on the Cross, and the Conclusions drawn from thence.

Before

Before I proceed any farther, I believe it will not be altogether improper for me, to apply once more to the Determinations of the Church of England in my Defence. *Art. XXXI.* the Title of which is ; *Of the one Oblation of Christ FINISHED upon the Cross.*--- And the Article it self begins thus: *The OFFERING of Christ once made, is that perfect Redemption, Propitiation and Satisfaction for all the Sins of the whole World, &c.* Now how was this Redemption, Propitiation, and Satisfaction effected, but by *Christ's* actually giving his Life a Ransom for many ? or as St. *John* expresses it¹, by *his laying down his Life for us* ? And where did he lay down his Life for us, but upon the Cross ? Besides that the Title of the Article points this out to us. So that from hence likewise it appears, that our Church's Doctrine is, that *Christ offer'd himself upon the Cross* ; and that this *Oblation* was *finished* also upon the Cross : Whereas these *Sacrificers* assert, that *Christ did not offer himself upon the Cross*, and that this Sacrifice, or Oblation was *not finished* till after he was ascended into the Presence of God.--- And let them not think to evade the Force of this, by saying it was levelled against the *Papists* ; for it as flatly contradicts *their Doctrine, in ipsissimis verbis*, as it does that of the *Papists*.

But it will be said, perhaps, that supposing *Christ* did, truly and properly, *offer himself upon the Cross* ; yet, since he was a Priest, after

¹ 1 Epist. iii. 16.

the Order of *Melchisedec*, he must have offer'd up the Bread and Wine at his last Supper^m. For, 'if we enquire what *Melchisedec* offer'd, 'we can find only *Bread* and *Wine*; we read 'of nothing else brought forth by him. And 'as our Saviour was a Priest according to his 'Order, it was necessary that he should also offer *Bread* and *Wine* as *Melchisedec*.---- And if 'Christ offered *Bread* and *Wine* in the holy Eucharist, we also must do the same; for we 'are commanded to do as he did.' And that *Melchisedec* offer'd up the *Bread* and *Wine* in Sacrifice to God, Mr. Bowyer is pleased to sayⁿ, the primitive Fathers unanimously assert.--- *Tertullian*, I presume, this Gentleman will allow to be a primitive Father; and he asserts the contrary (*lib. adversus Judæos*, §. 3.) in these Words: *Melchisedec IPSI ABRAHAMO---reverenti de prælio panem, & vinum obtulit.* And Mr. Johnson, in his *Unbloody Sacrifice*, tells us, That *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, and *Origen*, take no Notice of *Melchisedec*'s sacrificing the Bread and Wine: and very truly observes in the same Place, that *Cyprian* was the first among the Fathers of the Christian Church who broached this Doctrine.---- But to pass by this.----

Let us hear the Reasons assigned to prove that *Melchisedec* offer'd up the Bread and Wine, which he brought forth, in Sacrifice to God^o.

We

^m Brett, p. 77.

ⁿ Page 36.

^o Qui vero Aaronem aliis rebus, aliis Melchisedecum ad sacrificia usum judicant, Aaronem iis, quæ ante diximus, animalibus perinde ac inanimis, Melchisedecum nihil nisi pane & vino, hi

‘ We read (saith Dr. Brett^p) that he brought forth Bread and Wine. But why did he bring it forth, unless for Sacrifice? For it immediately follows, *And he was Priest of the most high God.* Why is such particular Notice taken of his being a *Priest*, if it had not been to inform us, that the *Bread and Wine* was the *Sacrifice offered?*--- In return, I must take the Liberty likewise to ask a few Questions. We read that *Melchisedec KING of Salem brought forth Bread and Wine:* but why did he bring them forth, if it was not to entertain *Abraham*? Why is such particular Notice taken of his being a *King*, unless it had been to inform us, that he, *as a King*, treated *Abraham* and all his Army?--- But it is said, ‘ he had no Occasion to bring forth such Provisions, merely to entertain *Abraham*, who, at that Time, certainly had no need of them, being plentifully stored with the Spoils of his Enemies. And if the Bread and Wine was not brought forth as a Sacrifice, it was brought without any Occasion for it.’---I answer; There was Occasion for it, notwithstanding his being plentifully stored

sanè, quantum mihi videtur, quare sic judicent, nihil habent. Panem hic & vinum Abrahamo & vernis ejus jam ex itinere, præliisque fessis ad vires reficiendas dedit. Similemque in simili causa morem finitimis fuisse regionibus non obscure docet Historia Sacra: neque Melchisedecus Sacerdos dicitur, quia panem illum & vinum protulit, sed ut hinc quisque intelligeret, quæ factum erat, ut Abrahamo solenni ritu benediceret (id quod sacerdotis fuit) tum etiam quare Abrahamus speliolum decimas ei dederit.--- Nihil ergo est, cur Melchisedecum pane solummodo atque vino, nihil quare rebus tantum inanimes Sacrificasse arbitremur. Imo vero est quamobrem contra judicemus, &c. Outram de Sacrificiis, lib. ii. cap. i. §. 2.

* Page 76.

H

with

with the Spoils of his Enemies ; for *Abraham* had lift up his Hand unto the Lord, the most high God, Creator of Heaven and Earth, that he would not take any Thing out of them. But it may be said, That the young Men had eaten of the Spoils. True ! a short Repast probably immediately after the Battle was over ; which might not render another Entertainment wholly unnecessary, both in respect of *Melchisedec's* Magnificence, and in common Civility, as well as Gratitude to *Abraham*.---- But it is said, That ' it is certain ' *Melchisedec* came to meet *Abraham* as a Priest, ' for *Moses* expressly mentions his coming as ' such, saying, *he was Priest of the most high ' God.*' I reply, it is certain *Melchisedec* came to meet *Abraham* as a King ; for *Moses* expressly mentions his coming as such, saying, *Melchisedec KING of Salem, brought forth Bread and Wine.* Upon the Whole therefore, Why may we not conclude with a learned Critic ^a, *Rex erat, & sic panem & vinum obtulit, Sacerdos erat, & sic benedixit, Abrahamo ?*

If I should be asked, wherein then was *Melchisedec* a Type of Christ, if not in this, that each of them offered a Sacrifice of Bread and Wine ? I must refer those that ask me, to the Epistle to the *Hebrews* ^r. Wherein it deserves
our

^a *Apud Poli Synops. Criticorum.*

^r Cap. v, vi, vii.

Unum autem alterum adumbrare potest vel re aliquâ, quam cum altero communem habet, — vel rei, quæ alteri insit, Symbolo — vel deniquè alio quovis modo, quo utique fiat ut res adumbrans cum adumbratâ aliquatenus comparari queat. Uti Melchisedecus Dei Sacerdos æternum nostrum Sacerdotem Jesum Christum adumbravit. Enim verò etiam si Melchisedecus reipsâ quidem Sacerdos æternus non
exti-

our particular Observation, that the Author, though he professedly draws a Parallel between our Saviour and *Melchisedec*, shewing in what Respects one was a Type of the other; yet gives not so much as the least Hint, that either our Saviour or *Melchisedec*, sacrificed the Bread or Wine.---- To this it may be objected^s, that 'when the Types of the *Old Testament* are al-
'ledged in the *New*, the most principal and
'obvious Correspondence of one with the other
'is oftentimes omitted, v. gr. *John* ii. 19. when
'our Saviour says, *Destroy this Temple, and I will*
'*raise it up in three Days*; No one can doubt,
'but that our Saviour, in these Words, affirms
'the Temple to be a Type of his Body; yet
'he omits to mention the main Thing where-
'in they agreed, which was the Inhabitation of
'the Deity. So likewise *John* iii. 14. our Sa-
'viour saith, *as Moses lift up the Serpent in the*
'*Wilderness: even so must the Son of Man be*
'*lifted up*; yet here is no Notice taken of that
'which 'tis supposed all Men will allow to be
'the most apt Point of Correspondence, viz.
'that as the Sight of the brazen Serpent was a
'Cure to them, who had been poisoned with
'the Bite of the fiery Serpents, so Faith in
'Christ is the certain Antidote against Sin.----
'Again,--- St. PAUL runs a Parallel between

extiterit, ei tamen æternitatis speciem, tenuem illam quidem & umbratilem, attribuerunt sacræ literæ; utpotè quæ tam illustris viri neque parentes, neque genealogiam, neque ortum obitumve memoraverunt, sed, contra atque in tantis viris facere solent, divino consilio reticuerunt. Outram. de Sacrif. lib. i. cap. xviii. Mox ab initio.

^s *Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice, Vol. I. p. 58. Edit. 2.*

‘*Sarah* and *Isaac*, and the Christian Church
 ‘and People on one Part; and *Agar* and *Ish-*
 ‘*mael*, and the Jewish Synagogue and People
 ‘on the other Part; but he omits to mention
 ‘that, which was as clear a Coincidence as any
 ‘that he mentions, viz. that *Ishmael* was cir-
 ‘*cumcised*, yet cast out, and not permitted to
 ‘be Coheir with *Isaac*’.---

In answer to which I observe, That in these Instances the omitted Correspondences are so plain and obvious, that there was no Necessity expressly to mention them; every one discovers them at first Sight. But what is it makes the Correspondence so plain and obvious? What but the *express* Mention of that Particular, wherein they do agree in the Writings of the *Old Testament*, which being so familiarly known, needed not to be repeated by the Writers of the *New*. That the Temple was the Place of God’s more immediate Presence, wherein he might be said to *dwell*, appears from those many Expressions in the *Old Testament*, of its being *the House of the Lord*; *an Habitation for the mighty God of Jacob*; of the Lord’s *choosing Sion*, and *desiring it for his Habitation*, saying; *This is my Rest for ever; here will I dwell, for I have desired it*; of its being *the Place where his Honour dwelt*; and *Solomon*, at the Dedication of it, said, *he had built God an House to dwell in, a settled Place for him to abide in for ever*.---- And it is expressly said, in the History of the Serpent which *Moses* set up in the Wilderness, that every one that had been bitten by the *fiery Serpents*, was cured by
 look-

looking up to the *brazen* Serpent.---- So likewise in the Case of *Ishmael*, it was well known, because recorded of him in the History, that he was *circumcised*, yet *nevertheless* he was cast out; for the Son of the Bond-Woman was not to be Heir with the Son of the Free.---- But as concerning *Melchisedec*, there is not the least Notice taken either in the History, or by the Apostle in his Parallel between *him* and our Saviour, that he *offered* up the *Bread* and *Wine* in Sacrifice to God: From whence I think we fairly conclude, that he *certainly* did not.

Another Argument, urged by the Assertors of a proper *Sacrifice* in the *Lord's Supper*, in Defence of their Hypothesis, is drawn from 1 Cor. x. 14---21.

The dearly beloved flee from Idolatry.

15. *I speak as unto wise Men; judge ye what I say.*

16. *The Cup of Blessing, which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?*

17. *For we being many, are one Bread, and one Body: for we are all Partakers of that one Bread.*

18. *Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the Sacrifices, Partakers of the Altar?*

19. *What say I then? That an Idol is any Thing, or that which is offered in Sacrifice to Idols is any Thing?*

20. *But I say, that the Things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have Fellowship with Devils.*

21. *Ye*

21. *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils : ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils.*

Upon this Passage the Author of *The Plain Account* made the following *just* Observation, p. 47. ' That though St. Paul found Occasion ' to speak here expressly of *Offerings* and *Sacrifices* made to Idols, and of the *Altar* in the ' *Jewish* Temple : yet when he comes to speak ' of the *Lord's Supper*, he does not once represent the *Bread* and *Wine*, as Things *offered* or ' *sacrificed* to God upon an *Altar* ; (which he ' could not have avoided, had he had that Notion of them) but, in the plainest Words, ' speaks of the *Cup of the Lord*, and of the ' *Table of the Lord*, and not of any *Altar*, or ' of any *Offering* of the *Bread* and *Wine*, or ' any *Sacrifice* made to God upon an *Altar*. ' And this, I think, will be found a good Argument against the Things themselves '.

In Opposition to this it is alledged ^u, that though the Apostle does not expressly say, That the *Bread* and *Wine* were offered to God ; yet it is plainly implied in the Comparison between the Table of the Lord, and the Table of Devils.---- The Eucharist, and the Heathen Sacrifices.---- That the Cup of Devils was that which was *offered* to Devils ; and so called be-

^t All that the Author of the *Sacrament of the Altar* saith in Relation to this, is in the following *polite* Style : ' Now he ' comes to *fight Tooth and Nail* with the Asserters of a Representative Sacrifice in the holy Eucharist, and thinks he has us ' *hard and fast*.' *Sacrament of the Altar*, p. 36.

^u Bouwyer, p. 46. Brett, p. 47. *Sacrament of the Altar*, p. 29.

cause it was offered to them: and therefore the Cup of the Lord does as plainly signify that which was *offered* to him.--- That the *Table* of Devils signifies the *Altar*, whereon the Sacrifices to Devils were *offered*: and therefore the *Table* of the *Lord* must mean the *Altar* of the *Lord*, and so be called, because something was *offered* to him on it.--- And that unless we take it for granted that the *eucharistical* Bread and Cup had been *offered*, the Parallel will be lost.

In all which it is either directly *asserted*, or strongly *implied*, that no two Things may be compared together, or can be parallel each to the other, except they agree in every Particular: Whereas, I humbly conceive, that there is a sufficient Ground for Comparison, or, to make the Parallel good, if there be an *Agreement* in the *main* Features, and *principal* Character.---- The Heathen's Sacrifices, and the Feasts upon them, were perform'd in a RELIGIOUS HONOUR to the Deities they worshipped; and every one who join'd in, or assisted at these *Sacrifices*, or *Feasts*, were supposed to do it as an Act of *religious Homage* to that particular Deity, to whom the Sacrifice was *offer'd*.---- The eating Bread, and drinking Wine in the *Lord's Supper*, is an Act of RELIGIOUS HONOUR to *Christ*, by Virtue of whose *Command alone*, it becomes our Duty; and in *Obedience* to whose Command alone, we perform those *sacred Actions*. And therefore it is plain, that the Meaning of, *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils: Ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table*
2 of

of Devils, is (as the Author of *The Plain Account* hath judiciously express'd it, p. 37.) ' You, ' who are Christians, and therefore are obliged ' to discourage every Appearance of that Wor- ' ship of Dæmons, which Christ came to abo- ' lish, cannot, without a great Crime, drink at ' the *Lord's Supper*, in Remembrance of *Christ's* ' Blood; and drink also with the Heathens of ' the *Cup*, which they drink at their Feasts in ' *Honour* to their false Gods. You cannot, ' without Guilt, partake of the *Lord's Table*, ' by eating *Bread* in Remembrance of him; ' and by this Action professing your selves his ' Disciples, and in Fellowship with him; and ' also partake of the *Tables* of these false Gods, ' by eating of the Sacrifices offer'd to them. ' You cannot be really the *Disciples* of *Christ*, ' and of any of these *false Gods* at the same ' Time. Nor can you perform one religious ' Action in *Honour* to *him*, and another of the ' same Kind, which (whatever your own ' Thoughts be) will appear to all around you, ' to be performed in *Honour* to the *Idols* of the ' Heathens, without great Inconsistency, and ' very bad Consequences from such Beha- ' viour.-----

The Design of the Apostle was, to dissuade the *Corinthians* from going to Feasts in the Idol-Temple with their Heathen-Neighbours; and as the *Medium* of his Argument, to prove the Incongruity and Sinfulness of going to them, he reminds them of a *religious* Feast they had among themselves in *Honour* to *Christ*; and tells them, That as by partaking of Bread and

Wine

Wine in the *Lord's Supper*, they did declare themselves to be in Communion and Fellowship with *Christ*, and thereby own'd *him* for their Lord and Master; so their partaking of the Feasts in the Idol-Temples would be a public Declaration of their joining in the Worship of those *false Gods*; which, at least, was a great Absurdity of Behaviour; and not only so, but likewise a Crime to *pay*, or even to *appear* to pay the same Act of outward Worship and religious Homage to a *false God*, as they did to *Christ*.--- And let it not be said any more, that the *Table of Devils* signifies the *Altar* whereon the Sacrifices to the Devils were offer'd; and therefore the *Table of the Lord* must mean the *Altar* of the Lord; and be so called, because something was *offered* to him on it; for this the Author of *The Plain Account* has sufficiently confuted already, p. 52. in these Words: 'St. Paul's sole End being to dissuade the *Christians* from partaking of these Feasts with the *Heathens*; for which he urges the *Inconsistency* of their being Partakers of the *Table* of the Lord, and of the *Tables* of Devils; [it is plain that] in this Argument the *Table* of the Lord cannot be oppos'd to the *Altars* of Dæmons, but to those *Tables*, to which *Christians* were enticed by their *Heathen* Neighbours; and therefore must come under the same Notion of a *Table*, properly so called, with those *Tables* at which the Heathens feasted.'

Neither let it be again repeated ^w, That St. Paul does not call it simply a *Table*, but the

^w Brett, p. 50.

Table of the Lord; and this Phrase being made Use of to denote an *Altar* in all other Places of Scripture, [the *Old Testament*] we must be strangely prejudiced, if we will, against such Evidence, take it in another Sense in this Text of St. *Paul*; for to this likewise there has been a full and sufficient Answer given in *The Plain Account*, p. 48, 49. 'An *Altar*, acknowledg'd
' and declar'd to be so in all its principal Uses,
' but serving also, in some other Respects, the
' Uses of a *Table*, may be justly sometimes called
' a *Table*. But it cannot follow from hence,
' that a *Table*, never plainly declar'd to serve
' any one Purpose of an *Altar*, nor once call'd
' by that Name, may properly be thought, or
' call'd so.--- The *Jewish Altar*, having been
' always declar'd an *Altar*, and yet serving some
' Purposes of a *Table*, might be sometimes call'd by this Name, without any Derogation
' from its higher Title. But the *Table* used in
' the *Lord's Supper*, having never been declar'd
' or call'd an *Altar*, nor appointed to serve any
' one peculiar Purpose of an *Altar*, ought to retain its one only original Name; and cannot
' properly be called by any *other*, which carries
' along with it an *Idea* of Uses for which a
' *Table* was never design'd.'

To this it is objected, That the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* does expressly call the *Table*, appointed to be used in the *Lord's Supper*, an *Altar*; saying, *Heb. xiii. 10. We have an ALTAR whereof they have no right to eat, who serve the Tabernacle.* The Sum of what they say, to prove that this Text refers to the
Lord's

Lord's Supper ; and that by *Altar*, is to be understood the *Table* to be used in the Celebration thereof, is this * : ' That the Word *eat*, is to be understood *literally* to signify *oral* eating, ' or eating with the Mouth ;---- That nothing ' can be *orally* eaten but what is *material* :--- ' That since there is an *Altar*, off or from which ' we are *orally* to *eat* ; therefore there must be ' a *material Sacrifice* in the Christian Church ; ' but nothing in the Christian Church, except ' the *Lord's Supper*, can be a *material Sacri-* ' *fice*, &c.'

But what if this Passage must be understood *Figuratively* ? What if the *literal* Construction of this Text be not so pertinent to the Apostle's Argument in this Place ? Then the Consequence is, that there is *no material Sacrifice* in the Christian Church ; that the *Lord's Supper* is not a Sacrifice, nor the *Table*, properly speaking, an *Altar*.

Let us therefore, in order to discover its true Meaning, consider this Text as it stands connected with the Context, *ver. 7---15*.

7. *Remember them which have the Rule over you, [gr. your Rulers] who have spoken unto you the Word of God ; whose Faith follow, considering the End of their Conversation.*

8. *Jesus Christ, the same Yesterday, to Day, and for ever.*

9. *Be not carried about with divers and strange Doctrines : For it is a good Thing that the Heart be established with Grace, not with*

* See *Sacrament of the Altar*, p. 59. *Brett*, p. 51. *Bowyer*, p. 55.

Meats, which have not profited them that have been occupied therein.

10. *We have an Altar, whereof they have no right to eat, which serve the Tabernacle.*

11. *For the Bodies of those Beasts, whose Blood is brought into the Sanctuary by the High Priest for Sin, are burnt without the Camp.*

12. *Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the People with his own Blood, suffered without the Gate.*

13. *Let us go forth therefore unto him without the Camp, bearing his Reproach.*

14. *For here we have no continuing City, but we seek one to come.*

15. *By him therefore let us offer the Sacrifice of Praise to God continually, that is, the Fruits of our Lips, giving Thanks to his Name.*

Before I proceed to lay before the Reader a Paraphrase of these Words, it will be necessary for me to observe in the first Place, That this Epistle was directed to *believing Jews*, who liv'd within the Confines of *Judæa*; and upon that Account more liable to be perverted from the Faith, both by the Arguments of the *unbelieving Jews*, their Neighbours and former Acquaintance; and also by the Persecutions which the Christians in those Parts were always liable to, and almost constantly underwent. Against both these the Apostle endeavours to arm them, shewing, by a Variety of Arguments, the great Superiority of the *Gospel Dispensation* over that of *Moses*; and laying before them a large Exhortation to *Patience* under Sufferings: and at

last proceeds to the Conclusion of his Letter, by giving them some general independent Lessons of Morality. But the main End he had in View in writing this Epistle, dwelling strongly upon his Mind (which was to preserve them from falling back to the *Law of Moses*, and resting their Hopes of Salvation on an exact Observance of the *Rituals* of that Law;) Upon mentioning their *Teachers*, who first converted them to the Faith, the former Argument, which fill'd and warmed his Mind, broke out again into what we find in the foregoing Paragraph.---

Which, we may observe in the next Place, is wrote, in a great Measure, in a *figurative* Style. The Gospel, by a *Figure*, is called *Grace*; and, by the same *Figure*, the *Law* is called *Meats*; the forsaking the *Law of Moses*, and adhering to the Gospel only, is, in a *figurative* Way of Speaking, likewise term'd *following Christ without the Camp*. Why therefore may not the partaking, or eating of the *Christian Altar*, by a like *Figure*, signify the receiving Benefit from *Christ crucified*? especially if we consider, that throughout the Apostle's whole Discourse in this *Epistle* (as the Author of *The Plain Account* has justly observ'd, p. 97.) *Christ* himself is the *High Priest*, the *Offerer*, the *Sacrificer* of himself: and therefore nothing but the real *Cross*, upon which *Christ* offer'd himself, can be the *Christian Altar*, in his [the Apostle's] Language.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, I would observe with the Author of *The Plain Account*, That it is not a *strict* Argument, only an *Illustration* of what he is desirous to convince them of; a *particular* Kind of Discourse, very allowable from the Custom of *that* Age, and the Principles of those with whom this Writer had to do; and not at all derogatory to the *Writer* himself, who never wish'd it to conclude more than he originally design'd it to do.---- And the Meaning of it may, I think, be *truly* express'd in the following Paraphrase.---

Ver. 7. 'Remember your Pastors and Teachers who first preach'd the Gospel to you; and considering the Conclusion of their Life and Behaviour, imitate their Faith.

8. 'For the Object of their Faith, *Jesus Christ*, is the same now as he was then, and will be the same for ever, to the End of Time.

9. 'Therefore let me exhort you not to listen to such Doctrines as are different from what they taught you, and which make no part of the Gospel of *Christ*, as that there is a Necessity ye should still continue to observe the Law of *Moses*, in order to your Justification: For it is much better to adhere to the Gospel only, trusting in the Sacrifice of *Christ* alone, and not in any of the *Jewish* Sacrifices, which have not profited them who have been occupied therein.

10. 'Neither suffer your selves to be drawn aside from the Gospel with that Argument, that unless ye adhere to the Law of *Moses*, ye cannot

receive any Benefit from the Sacrifices offer'd at the Temple ; for under the Gospel there is a Sacrifice of much greater Value, of more universal Extent and Influence, viz. the Sacrifice of *Christ Jesus* himself upon the Altar of the Cross ; which those, who still adhere to the Law of *Moses*, can receive no Benefit from : *Christ is become of none Effect to them, whosoever of them are justified by the Law, they are fallen from Grace : Christ shall profit them nothing,* Gal. v. 2, 4.

11. ' And remember that the Bodies of those Beasts, whose Blood is brought into the Sanctuary by the High Priest on the Day of Expiation, are burnt without the Camp.

12. ' In Conformity to which, *Jesus* also, that he might sanctify the People with his own Blood, suffer'd without the Gate.

13. ' Let us therefore go forth to him, away from the legal Institutions, bearing the Reproach of trusting in a crucified Saviour : Let us, I say, go forth to him without the Camp, i. e. leave the *Rituals* of the Law of *Moses*, and rest our Hopes of Salvation only in *Faith*.

14. ' For this City of *Jerusalem*, together with the Temple, will soon be destroy'd ; and then, of Course, all the Sacrifices and Oblations, and ritual Services perform'd therein will cease, and be no more for ever. Therefore we should take Care to secure to ourselves an Inheritance in the New *Jerusalem*, which is to be obtained, not by an Observe
vance

‘ vance of the Law of *Moses*, but through
 ‘ Faith in *Christ*.

15. ‘ Accordingly, let us apply our selves to
 ‘ God through him, as our only Mediator and
 ‘ High Priest, *who is able to save them to the*
 ‘ *uttermost, that come unto God by him, seeing*
 ‘ *he ever liveth to make Intercession for them:*
 ‘ And let us constantly offer up our Sacrifices
 ‘ through him, not *material* Sacrifices, such as
 ‘ the *Jews* offer up in their Temple; but the
 ‘ *spiritual* Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving,
 ‘ *i. e.* the Fruit of our Lips, giving Thanks to
 ‘ his Name.’

If we observe the Apostle's Design in this Place, it will appear that he had not the least Occasion to speak here of the *Lord's Supper*. His Design was to excite the *Hebrews* to a true Faith in *Christ*, and not to trust to the Law of *Moses* for Justification. In order to do this, it was not so much to his Purpose to say, ‘ If ye
 ‘ still adhere to the Law of *Moses*, and depend
 ‘ on that for Justification, ye cannot be Parta-
 ‘ kers of the *Lord's Supper*.’ But to say, ‘ If ye
 ‘ still adhere to the Law of *Moses*, and expect
 ‘ Salvation, not through the Merits of *Christ's*
 ‘ Death, but an exact Observance of the *Ritu-*
 ‘ *als* of the Law, ye cannot receive any Bene-
 ‘ fit from *his* Death, *Christ shall profit you no-*
 ‘ *thing*.’ This is an Argument to his Purpose, and prov'd all that he aim'd at. And what will, I think, confirm this Interpretation of the Text, with all considering Persons, is this; that St. Paul, when he had the same End in View, in

writing to the *Galatians*, actually did make use of this Argument in *plain* Terms, which Words I have inserted into the Paraphrase of the Text under Debate, as being parallel thereto.

That the *general* Design of this Epistle to the *Hebrews*, is the same of that to the *Galatians*, is evident to every one who has but just look'd into them, *viz.* to shew the *Nullity* and *Insignificancy* of the *Mosaic* Institutions under the *Gospel*; and that Faith alone is the Means of Justification; and therefore the *same* Arguments the Apostle made use of in *one*, 'tis reasonable to think he would make use of in the *other* also, though expressed in a *different* Manner, according to the different Tempers, Manners and Customs of the Persons to whom he wrote. And in this Epistle to the *Hebrews*, we may observe, the Apostle throughout speaks of *Christian* Privileges in *Jewish* Phrases, and therefore they are to be interpreted *accordingly*; nor can we have a better Clue to guide us to the *true* Meaning of them, than what the Apostle speaks more *plainly*, when he is treating of the same Subject to other Persons.---- This is the Method I have taken, in order to find out the true Interpretation of this Text.---- And I thought it might be of Use, thus largely to lay before the Reader the Design of the Apostle in this Place; because it is indeed the *ONLY* Text which, at *first Sight*, seems to speak on our Adversaries Behalf.---- But to proceed.----

The Author of *The Plain Account* had observ'd, p. 49, 50. 'That as the *Lord's Supper*

' answers to, and takes its Name from the *Pas-*
 ' *chal Supper* ; so the *Lord's Table* answers to
 ' the *Table* that was spread for the partaking of
 ' that *Supper*.---- That the *Paschal Supper* was
 ' distinct from the *Sacrifice* of the *Lamb*, and
 ' after it. To this alone it is that the *Lord's*
 ' *Supper* answers ; which was made to consist in
 ' eating and drinking *Bread* and *Wine*, in Re-
 ' membrance of that *Offering* once made by
 ' *Christ* ; of which *Offering* it self, it was im-
 ' possible for *Christians* to eat. And conse-
 ' quently, as the *Lord's Supper* answers not to
 ' the *Sacrifice* of the *Lamb*, but to the *Comme-*
 ' *morative Supper*, celebrated by the *Jews* after
 ' that *Sacrifice* ; so the *Lord's Table* does not
 ' come in the Place of the *Altar*, on which the
 ' *Lamb* was sacrificed, but of that *Table* on
 ' which the *Paschal Supper* was put, in order
 ' to be eaten (with the Cup of *Blessing* or
 ' *Thanksgiving*, which was no Part of the fore-
 ' going *Sacrifice*) in *Memory* of their great De-
 ' liverance out of *Egypt* ; and in their own
 ' Houses, where there could be no Thought of
 ' any *Altar*.'

In Opposition to this it is said *, That since
 the *Lord's Supper* answers to the *Paschal Sup-*
per, it must be a Feast on a Commemorative
Sacrifice, because that was so : ' That as what
 ' the *Paschal Supper* consisted of had been offered
 ' to God, so the *Bread* and *Wine*, of which the
 ' *Lord's Supper* consists, are likewise to be offered
 ' to God.'---- Again---- ' That as the *Lord's*

* See the Sacrament of the Altar, p. 39, 40. Bowyer, p. 48.

Supper answers to the *Paschal Supper*, one as well as the other, must be a Feast on a *Sacrifice*; and consequently the *Lord's Table* answers to the *Altar*, on which the *Paschal Lamb* was *offer'd*.--- 'That unless we suppose the *Lord's Supper* answers to the *Paschal Supper*, as what is eaten in each of them, was first *offered* to God; there is not *Agreement* enough between them to say one *answers* to the other, &c.' As if no two Things could be said to *answer* one another, unless they agreed in every Particular!

That the *Lamb*, of which the *Paschal Supper* consisted, had been first *offer'd* up in *Sacrifice* to God, [by the Blood's being sprinkled, and the Inwards burnt upon the *Altar*] is readily allow'd on all Hands: It was an *eucharistical* or *thanksgiving* Sacrifice. But to call it a *Commemorative Sacrifice*, (as the Term has no Foundation in Scripture, so likewise) do I judge to be highly *improper*; because the *Commemoration* of their Deliverance out of *Egypt* was not made at the Time of the *Oblation*, but afterwards, in their own Houses, at *Supper*; which *Commemoration* likewise, was as distinct from the *Oblation*, as our eating *Bread* and drinking *Wine* at the *Lord's Table*, is distinct from the *Oblation* of *Christ* himself upon the *Altar* of the *Cross*. Mr. Bowyer, I find, understands that Passage in *The Plain Account*, 'The *Paschal Supper* was distinct from the *Sacrifice* of the *Lamb*, and after it,' as if the Author had asserted, that the *Jews* ate another *Supper* beside the *Lamb*. No! the *Author* does not say, that

that the *Paschal Supper* was distinct from the *Lamb sacrificed*, but from the *Sacrifice* of the Lamb, and after it, *i. e.* the Lamb was *eaten* neither at the same Time, nor Place, in which it was *offer'd*. It was *offer'd* in the *Afternoon*, at the *Temple*; it was *eaten* at their own *Houses* several *Hours after*. It was *offer'd* as a *Sacrifice* of *Thanksgiving*; it was *eaten* in *Memory* of their great Deliverance out of *Egypt*.---- It was not *offer'd* up in *Sacrifice* as a *Memorial* to God; on the contrary, it was designed, and expressly declared to be a *Memorial* to the Children of *Israel*: But surely it was *not offer'd* upon the *Altar* for a *Memorial* to them; for I believe it is an allow'd Maxim, *Sacrificiorum omnium vis circa Deum versatur*.----

The Truth of the Case is this: The *Oblation* of all Peace Offerings [among which the *Paschover* is to be reckon'd as one] was the same *religious Rite* among the *Jews*, as saying Grace before Meat is now among us. For we find, that while they were in the Wilderness, they were not permitted to eat of any living Creature, but what had been first *offer'd* at the *Tabernacle*; but when they came to be settled in the Land of *Canaan*, if they liv'd at any great Distance from the Place which God had chose to put his Name there, and upon that Account it was impossible for them to have it *offer'd* upon the *Altar* of the *Lord*; they were commanded to do what was, in a *Manner*, equivalent to it, to perform a *kind of vicarious Oblation*, by pouring out the Blood upon the Earth. Accordingly, as *Prayer* and *Thanksgiving* are now

now succeeded into the Place of the *material Oblation* of the Blood *upon the Altar*; so nothing more now is requir'd to make the *Paschal Supper*, and the *Lord's Supper*, answer to each other in every Respect.

These Words, 1 Cor. v. 8. *Christ our Passover is [or hath been] sacrificed for us; therefore let us keep the Feast, not with the old Leaven, neither with the Leaven of Malice and Wickedness; but with the unleavened Bread of Sincerity and Truth*: 'Supposing them to relate [the Author of *The Plain Account* very justly observes] as some have imagin'd, to the *Lord's Supper*, instituted in Remembrance of our *Paschal Lamb*, only teach us, that we ought to partake of this, which is our *Paschal Feast*, with such sincere, untainted, honest Hearts, as become Christians.'---- The Author of *The Sacrament of the Altar*, on the contrary, says, p. 55. that, 'supposing the Apostle to speak here of the *Lord's Supper*, he plainly speaks of it as a *Sacrifice*, in which *Christ is sacrificed*, or offered for us *Representatively*, in the appointed Representations and Memorials of his Body and Blood.' Thus he proves it:---

'The *Feast*, of which the Apostle speaks, is plainly the Feast of the *Eucharist*; for he speaketh of something to be eaten as the *Paschal Supper* was eaten; but that which answers to the *Paschal Supper* is the *Lord's Supper*. The Sum therefore of the Apostle's Command is, that they should exclude the incestuous Person, and keep themselves as free
' from

' from all Wickedness, when they celebrated
 ' the *Lord's Supper*, as the *Jews* were obliged
 ' to keep themselves free from all Leaven, when
 ' they celebrated the annual *Paschal Supper*.---
 Well! and what then? How does this prove
 that the Apostle, supposing him to speak here
 of the *Lord's Supper*, speaks of it as a *Sacrifice*,
 in which *Christ* is representatively *sacrificed*, or
 offered for us?--- Here I must profess my own
 Short-sightedness; for I really can discover no-
 thing like it.--- On the contrary; supposing
 the *Lord's Supper* to be here meant, does not
 the Apostle *expresly* call it a *Feast*, not a *Sacri-*
fice? Does he not represent *Christ* himself in
 Person, as our *Passover* or *Paschal Lamb*,
 which had been *sacrificed* for us?---- By virtue
 of this *Sacrifice*, we are *deliver'd* from Sin and
 Death, in like Manner as the *Israelites* were
deliver'd in the Land of *Egypt*, when all the
 first Born of the *Egyptians* were slain. The
 Sum therefore of the Apostle's Command (sup-
 posing him to speak here of the *Lord's Supper*)
 is, in this Author's own Words, that we should
 keep our selves as free from all Wickedness,
 when we celebrate the *Lord's Supper* [institu-
 ted in *Remembrance* of this our great Deliver-
 ance] as the *Jews* were obliged to keep them-
 selves free from all Leaven, when they cele-
 brated the annual *Paschal Supper* [in Remem-
 brance of their great Deliverance in *Egypt*].
 ' But at *this Rate* of arguing (replies our Au-
 ' thor) ^a the *Annual Commemorative Paschal*

^a Sacrament of the Altar, p. 56.

'Supper, in the latter Part of the Argument, is made to be the same as the *original Paschal Lamb*, which cannot be.'--- Here again, I must profess my own Short-sightedness; for I really can discover nothing like it.---Thus much supposing the Words to relate to the *Lord's Supper*.---

But I conceive that there is no Necessity for this Supposition, that the *Lord's Supper* is here particularly intended. And to what the Author of *The Plain Account* has said in relation to this Point, I beg leave to add a Conjecture, that it is only an Allusion, which the *Season* of the Year, the Apostle wrote this Epistle in, hinted to him, viz. about the Time of EASTER. The Ground for this Conjecture is, that ἐορταζω, the Word here used, signifies to *keep Holiday* as well as to *celebrate a Feast*; and accordingly the marginal Reading in some Editions of the Bible is *holy Day*. Upon this Supposition the Sum of the Apostle's Command is, that they should exclude the *incestuous* Person, that so, in the approaching FESTIVAL, they might be as free from the Leaven of *Wickedness*, as the *Jews* were obliged to be free from all Leaven of *Bread*.---- As this is no more than Conjecture, I offer it as *such only*, building nothing upon it. For supposing the Words to relate to the *Lord's Supper*, yet no Argument can be drawn from them in favour of our Adversary's Doctrine, as, I trust, has been made sufficiently to appear already.

The next Particular that demands our Attention, is an Interpretation given by the Author

of the *Sacrament of the Altar* to these Words, 1 Cor. xi. 26. *As often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come.* By which Words (saith this Author^b) the Apostle must be understood to mean that we shew forth the Lord's Death to God, by representing to him the Death and Passion of his dear Son, in the *appointed Memorials* thereof. And for Proof of this Interpretation, refers us to *Deut. xxvi. 3.* where, he tells us, the same Word is used.---- On the contrary, I observe, that the Word used in *Deuteronomy*, is ἀναγγέλλω; that used by St. Paul, is καταγγέλλω; in the exact Meaning of which Words, I believe, there may be some Difference: And if we resolve the Word used by the Apostle into those of which it is compounded, the most natural Construction seems to be this, καὶ ἀλλήλους ἀγγέλλετε, *inter vos invicem annunciatis.* But not to insist on this; suppose the Words bear the same general Interpretation; yet, in that Verse cited from *Deuteronomy*, there is added Κυεῖω τῷ Θεῷ: But so it is not in this Passage of the Apostle. Ergo---

Lastly, Mr. Bowyer observes, p. 60. that it is said of the first *Prophets and Teachers*, Acts xiii. 2. that *they did MINISTER to the Lord.* ' Now (saith he) though λειτουργεῖν does not always signify to sacrifice, but sometimes to minister in general; yet they being here said λειτουργεῖν τῷ Κυεῖω, this cannot so properly be said of *Preaching*, as *Praying*, (which is the more probable, as *Fasting* is joined to it.)

^b Page 16.

And

And this being expressed by a *sacrificial* Word, seems to intimate, that they offer'd up *Incense* [*Prayer*] and a *pure Offering* together, [*An Oblation of Bread and Wine*] according to the above-cited Prophecy of *Malachi*.---- This Author here seems to intimate, that the *Original* Meaning of the Word *λειτουργέω*, is to *offer Sacrifice*; that this is likewise the most *general* Acceptation of the Word; and that it only *sometimes* signifies to *minister* in general. The contrary to which is evident to every one who has the least Knowledge of the *Greek* Tongue; for it signifies to perform any *public* Office whether *Sacred* or *Civil*.---- That the Signification of it, in this Place, is *praying*, I very readily assent to: But how does this prove that they *offered* up a *Sacrifice* of *Bread* and *Wine*? If he means to insinuate that *Prayer* necessarily includes *material Sacrifice*, I believe he will find but few Abettors. But it is expressed by a *sacrificial* Word, he saith. I answer, That it is highly improper to call a Word a *sacrificial* Term indefinitely, because it is sometimes used in *that* Sense; whereas, its known common Signification is to perform any public Office, or Action whatever. This is a simple Way of Talking; whereby, if they are imposed on themselves, they are *weak*; and if thereby they knowingly would impose on others, they are *dishonest*.

There is likewise a very particular Interpretation of *Rom. xv. 16.* given us by this Gentleman; but as he seems to distrust the Arguments brought by him to support, and professes

not to insist upon it, I shall not detain the Reader, by entering into a particular Examination of what he saith concerning it, but refer those who desire Satisfaction herein, to Dr. WHITBY, and Mr. LOCKE upon the Place.

I have thus gone through every Argument, drawn from the holy Scriptures by these Men, in Defence of their Hypothesis; and upon a Review of the Whole, let the World judge on whose Side the Truth lays.---

I should here have put an End both to the Reader's Trouble and my own; but that there is such an Interpretation given of a Passage in our *Catechism*, and of another in the *Communion-Office*, by the Author of the *Sacrament of the Altar*, as loudly calls for an Animadversion.---

In the *Catechism* is this Question: *Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?* The Answer is: *For the continual Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, and of the Benefits which we receive thereby.*---The Interpretation (and it is a monstrous one!) put upon these Words by this Author, is this^c. 'For
' the making a continual Memorial before God
' of the grand Sacrifice of *Christ*, and thereby
' for the continual Pleading the Benefits of the
' Covenant purchased thereby; or, in other
' Words, For the bringing of the grand Sacrifice of *Christ's* Body and Blood, and the Covenant of Grace, the Sum of the Benefits
' purchased for us thereby, into continual Re-

^c *Sacrament of the Altar*, p. 90.

‘ remembrance before God, that he may see and
 ‘ behold the one (the Sacrifice of *Christ*) in the
 ‘ appointed Representations thereof, and so re-
 ‘ member the other (the Covenant of Grace)
 ‘ for our Good.’ ‘ Our Church (*continues* he)
 ‘ doth herein plainly teach us, that the Lord’s
 ‘ Supper was ordain’d, to bring the Sacrifice of
 ‘ *Christ*’s Death, and the Covenant of Grace
 ‘ purchased thereby, into continual Remem-
 ‘ brance before God, and that by unavoidable
 ‘ Consequence, for the applying and confirming
 ‘ the Benefits thereof to us.’

That the Church is the best Interpreter of
 her own Doctrine, this Author will him-
 self, I believe, allow. And whether he hath
 given us the true Meaning of this Passage
 in the *Catechism*, nay, whether he has not
 most *monstrously* perverted it, I will leave the
 Reader to determine, when he has read the
 following Passage; which I must beg Leave to
 transcribe once more from the Exhortation ap-
 pointed to be used at the Time of Celebration
 of the *Lord’s Supper*. (The Question in the
 Catechism is, *What was the End of Christ’s in-*
stituting the Lord’s Supper?) ‘ To the End that
 ‘ WE SHOULD ALWAYS REMEMBER the ex-
 ‘ ceeding great Love of our Master, and only
 ‘ Saviour *Jesus Christ*, thus dying for us, and
 ‘ the innumerable Benefits which, by his pre-
 ‘ cious Blood-shedding he hath obtained to us;
 ‘ he hath *instituted* and *ordained* holy Myste-
 ‘ ries as Pledges of Love, and for a continual
 ‘ Remembrance of his Death, to our great and
 ‘ endless Comfort.’ And when the Minister

giveth Warning for the Celebration of the Communion, he is to tell the People, ' That the ' Sacrament of the Body and Blood ' of *Christ* is ' to be *by them received* (not offer'd up to God) ' *in Remembrance* of his '[*Christ's*] meritorious ' Cross and Passion.' And in the Exhortation appointed to be read, when he shall see the People negligent to come to the holy Communion, ' It is your Duty to *receive the Communion in Remembrance* (not offer it up for a ' Memorial to God) of the 'Sacrifice of *Christ's* ' Death, as he himself hath commanded.' And from the Prayer of Consecration we may learn our Church's Doctrine to be, that we continue a perpetual Memory of that his precious Death, until his coming again, by *our receiving* Bread and Wine (not offering them up in Sacrifice to God) according to our Saviour *Jesus Christ's* holy Institution, in *Remembrance* of his Death and Passion.---- And so far as I can discern, nothing like this Doctrine of the *Bread and Wine* being to be *offered* up in *Sacrifice* to Almighty God, to put him in Mind of our Saviour's Death and Passion, can be collected from any Passage in our Catechism, Liturgy, or Homilies: But rather the contrary manifestly appears at first Sight. The *only* Oblations and Sacrifice mention'd throughout to be on our Parts perform'd, are *Alms, Praise and Thanksgiving*; and *our selves* to be a holy, reasonable, and lively Sacrifice unto Almighty God; no Mention, no, not the least Hint of any *Sacrifice of Bread and Wine*.

This our Author calls ^d, ' a wilful Misrepresentation of our Communion-Office ; for that the Priest is enjoined to *offer* on God's Table *Bread* and *Wine*, and then to beseech God to accept those *Oblations* or *Offerings* of *Bread* and *Wine*.' I, on the contrary, observe, that by *Oblations* in the Prayer next following the *Offertory* (which is so called, because, while that is said, the People are to make their *Offerings*) we are not to understand the *Bread* and *Wine* ; but the Money that hath been collected from the Congregation (the Particle *and* being only *exegetical* in this Place) and what confirms this is, that the Priest is ordered *hum- bly* to PRESENT the Alms, but only to *place* the *Bread* and *Wine* upon the *Table* ; which last, I conceive, he is ordered to do, *only* for the more *decent Solemnity* of the Action.

But to proceed.--- The Passage in the *Com- munion-Office*, which he hath treated in the same rough Manner, with that in the *Cate- chism*, is the Form of Words, appointed to be used by the Minister, when he delivers the *Bread* and *Cup* into the Communicants Hands. *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, and the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy Body and Soul unto everlasting Life.* The Meaning of which, according to this Author, is (and this he *preposterously* calls the *plain na- tural Construction* of the Words ^e) ' The

^d Sacrament of the Altar, p. 68.

^e Page 77, 78.

' Body

‘ Body of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, which was
 ‘ just now representatively given or offered to
 ‘ God for thee, preserve thy Body and Soul
 ‘ unto everlasting Life. He (the Minister)
 ‘ takes the *representative Body of Christ* into his
 ‘ Hand ; and, N. B. holds it *to* and *before*
 ‘ God, and prays that it may preserve the Com-
 ‘ municant’s Body and Soul unto everlasting
 ‘ Life.--- The same, *mutatis mutandis*, may be
 ‘ said of the Cup, the *representative Blood of*
 ‘ *Christ*.’

What this Author means by holding the *representative Body of Christ to and before God*, I am really at a Loss to conceive, unless he means the same, as the Papists do by the *Elevation of the Host*, which is expressly condemned by the *twenty eighth* Article of our Church, as contrary to the Ordinance of *Christ*.--- And that this Construction of these Words cannot be the true one, is evident from the Manner of Expression at the Delivery of the Cup ; *the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was SHED for thee*. But the *representative Blood of Christ* [the Wine] cannot be said to be *shed* ; this is only *pour’d* out : It is the *real Blood alone* of our Saviour *Christ*, that can, with any *Propriety*, be said to have been *shed* for us. And if the *real Blood of Christ* be here to be understood, consequently the *real Body of Christ* must be understood at the Delivery of the Bread.

To conclude.---- Upon a Review of the Whole, let the Reader determine what Ground

there is for Mr. Bowyer so peremptorily to pronounce^f, ' That whoever, in the Celebration of the *Lord's Supper*, does not offer up the Bread and Wine, as a *Memorial* before God, to put *him* in Remembrance of *Christ's* Death, there is the greatest Reason in the World to believe, that he *most certainly* does *not* perform this Duty agreeably to the End of the Institution.' What a Reflection is this upon the *greatest* Part of the *English* Clergy! How *lame* and *imperfect* does this represent our *Communion Office*, in which there is not any Form of *Oblation*! How must this delight every Enemy of the *establish'd* Church, to hear one of her own Pastors condemning her in what he esteems to be an *essential* Point!

After all, I may, perhaps, be ask'd, since there appears to be so *little*, or rather *no* Ground for this Doctrine of the *Lord's Supper* being a *Sacrifice* in the holy Scriptures; How came it to pass, that it gain'd so early an Admittance into the *Christian* Church? And, I *conjecture*, it may have happen'd *thus*: It was a common Objection, made both by *Jews* and *Heathens* against the *Christian* Religion, that it could not be an Institution which had God for its Author, since it wanted the most solemn of all religious Services, and which was the most essential Branch of religious Worship, *viz.* SACRIFICE. To which the Apostles, and first Teachers of the Gospel, answer'd; That God was not to be worshipped with Mens Hands, as though he

88 *The LORD'S SUPPER, &c.*

needed any Thing, seeing he giveth to all Life and Breath, and all Things: That *Sacrifice* was no more than a *positive* Institution, which might be abrogated at the Will of the supreme Lawgiver: And withal, readily own'd, that they had no other Sacrifice but *δουλας αἰνέσεως* & *ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΙΑΣ*, the Sacrifices of *Praise* and *Thanksgiving*; which those who follow'd, misinterpreting, imagin'd the Apostles had meant the Sacrifices of *Praise*, and of the EUCHARIST.

F I N I S.



te
e
h
e
t
s
e
l
d
-